

20
A
REPLY
TO A
VINDICATION
OF THE
LETTER

Published in a Pamphlet called

Partiality Detected.

In which the Remarks upon that Letter are made Good, and the Proceedings of the Lower House of Convocation shewn to be set in a true Light, and Justified against the Injurious and Defective Representation which the Vindicator has given of them.

By a Member of the Lower House of Convocation.

— Mille adde Catenas,
Effugiet tamen hac sceleratus Vincula PROTEUS. Hor.

D U B L I N :

Printed by *Edwin Sandys* for *Thomas Servant*,
at the *Bible* in *Castle-Street*, 1710.

A
 REFLECTY
 TO A
 VINDICATION
 OF THE
 LETTER
 Published in a Pamphlet called
 Partially Delected.

In which the Reasons upon that Letter are
 made Good, and the things of the Lower
 House of Convocation is set in a true
 light and justice, the Injuries and De-
 lective Representation which the Vindicator has
 given of them.



By a Member of the Lower House of Convocation.
 Printed by E. Smith, at the Sign of the
 Three Mills, in the Strand.

DUBLIN:
 Printed by E. Smith, at the Sign of the
 Three Mills, in the Strand. 1710.

The CONTENTS.

SECTION I.

BEING an Introduction to the following Papers. Page 1

A Committee appointed to examine the Doctor. 3

The Committee finds it to be a False and Scandalous Libel, &c. ibid

And that the Author of it ought to be proceeded against with the severest Censures. ib.

SECT. II.

IN which is considered what the Vindicator has said concerning the Accusation brought by Dr. Lamberts against the Two Members. 6

The V's Assertion, that the Paper of the Two Members was seen at Oxford before their appearing in the Lower House in England, shewn to be False. 9

And not so much as asserted by the Author of P. D. of the V. pretends. 10

The V's Distinction between a Publick and a Private Capacity consider'd. 14

SECT. III.

IN which is considered what the Vindicator has said as to the Facts reported by the Two Members to have been transacted in the L. H. of Convocation. 19

The V's Abuse Reasoning upon the word Defer. 20

The Provincial Writ proved to have been fully and regularly Executed. 21

The Resolutions of the Committee concerning the Execution of the Provincial Writ. 23

The Clergy Eluded upon the Promulgation, proved never to have met themselves in the Meetings of the Dublin Clergy. 24

The Resolution of the Committee as to that point. 25

The Account given by the V. of the Election of the Vice-Prolocutor, shewn to be False. ib.

The Resolutions of the Committee as to that point. 26

The Method of choosing a Prolocutor in this present Convocation, not different from that used in the Convocation of 1661, as asserted by the Letter-Writer. 27

The Resolution of the Committee as to the point. ibid

The Archbishops and Bishops, who Answered the Earl of Nottingham's Letter, Vindicated as to what they said concerning the Power of the L. H. to Adjourn it self. 29
That Power proved to be in the L. H. from the acknowledgment of my L. Primate. 30
That the L. H. in 1661, enjoy'd this Right proved from the Testimony of the Archbishop of Tuam. 32

The Resolution of the L. H. of Convocation concerning the Archbishop of Tuam's Testimony. 33

The Testimony of Bishop Sheridan, as to this point. 34

The Resolution of the L. H. concerning Bishop Sheridan's Testimony. 34

The same point proved from the Journals of the Upper House in 1661. ibid

The Letter-Writer's Mistake as to the Forms of Adjournment. 36

The Resolution of the Committee as to that point. 37

The Resolutions of the Committee concerning the Messages relating to the Virger affirm'd by the Letter-Writer to have passed between the Two Houses. 39

The Resolution of the Committee concerning the Reflection cast upon the Bishops by the Vindicator. 42

The Declaration of both Houses of Convocation, Vindicating the Clergy from being disaffected to the Government and the Succession. 44

Resolutions of the House of Commons to the same purpose. 46

The V's Insinuations against the Clergy, notwithstanding the said Resolutions. 47

The Resolution of the Committee against the Letter-Writer's Assertion, concerning the Synodus Anglicana. 49

The General Observations of the Letter-Writer shewn to be illgrounded. ibid

Dr. Lamberts answerable for the Truth of the Matter contained in the Preface to the Claims of Rights. 53

The Vindicator's feeble Defence of the Author of Partiality Detected. 56

SECT.

IN CONTENTS.

SECT. IV.

I N which is considered the <i>Vindicator's</i> unjust and groundless Reflections upon the <i>Remarker</i> and others.	60
Some Instances of the <i>V's</i> Reproachfull Language.	61
His black Charge against the Clergy of Ireland in general.	62
Books said to be handed about amongst the Lower-Clergy.	63
The <i>Remarker</i> always a Friend to the Revolution.	65
The Rehearsal, &c.	ibid.
Mr. Craig's Book of Government.	66
Mr. Dodwell's Book, not such as the <i>Vindicator</i> represents it to be.	67
The <i>Vindicator's</i> Reflection upon the Bishops of England.	68
The <i>Remarker</i> never of any Club but where Honourable mention was made of King William, and where a particular Regard was had to her Majesty's Government, and the Protestant Succession.	ibid.
The <i>Vindicator's</i> pious sayings.	69
The <i>V's</i> sly Proposal to draw the L. H. of Ireland into the Dispute between the Two Houses in England.	ibid.
The Dispute between the House of Commons and L. H. of Convocation in 1704. begun and fomented by the Letter-Writer.	71
The Vote of the House of Commons in favour of the Rights and Privileges of the L. H. of Convocation.	73
Another in favour of the Church.	ibid.
The <i>V.</i> charges the Youth of the College with ill Principles, and the Governors with want of Discipline.	74
His unfortunate attempts against the <i>Remarker</i> .	75
The inconsistent Character which he gives of the <i>Remarker</i> .	76

SECT. V.

C ontaining a True Account of the Proceedings of the Lower-House in relation to the Letter; with some Observations on the false account given by the <i>Vindicator</i> .	77
A full account of the Debate relating to the Abundance of Pains, Art, and Indu-	

stry said to be used in Ireland.	81
Dr. Synge's Maxim, that Every Writing as well as every Man is presumed to be Good and True 'till the contrary be made to appear, Consider'd.	82
Those said by the L. W. to have acted under a Pretence of Zeal for the Church shewn to be the Clergy of Ireland, and not the Clergy of England.	84
The Protest of the Thirteen Members together with the Occasion of it.	86
A Vindication of the Protest.	88
His Excellency's Order of Reference to the Primate and the Lord Archbishop of Dublin, relating to the said Protest.	91
Their Graces Answer.	ibid.
The Message sent from the L. H. to the Upper relating to the Protesting Members.	92
The Committee come to several Resolutions against the Letter.	95
Dr. Lambert's and Dr. Synge's Argument why the House should not take Cognizance of the Letter.	96
The House receives the Report.	ibid.
The two first Resolutions agreed to by the House.	97
Dr. Synge's Argument in favour of that which the Committee had voted to be false and Scandalous &c.	ibid.
Interrupted by a Prorogation.	ibid.
The Upper-House orders the Bishops of Ossery and Killaloe to go forthwith to England and lay the whole Proceedings of Convocation in this Matter before the Queen.	99
The Objections made by Dr. Lambert &c. against the Protest, answered.	ibid.
Dr. Synge's odd Notice of a Protest.	102
Dr. Lambert's &c. Objections against the Message sent from the L. H. to the Upper relating to the Protest, shewn to be frivolous.	104
Some few instances of the sincerity of the <i>V's</i> Narrative.	106
A Message from the Upper-House to the Lower concerning a Scandalous Healer.	109
The Answer of the Lower-House.	110
Another Message.	ibid.
The Answer of the Lower-House.	111
The Privileges of Convocation invaded.	112
Vindicated by the House of Lords in Parliament.	ibid.

i

T H E

P R E F A C E.

TH E Proceedings in Convocation the last Session were so very remarkable, and the Behaviour of some Persons so surprizing, that it may reasonably be demanded, why as yet no true Account has been given of them; And yet for Me they might for ever have lain buried in Silence and Forgetfulness, had not Some, who are like to gain but little Credit by the Publication of them, made it necessary.

But now since a Libel, under the name of a Vindication, has been Published by the very Person, whom the Lower House has Censured, in which He has given a very False and Partial Account of the Proceedings against him; since he complains of hard Usage, and appeals to the World, and, instead of being Humble and Penitent under the mild Correction that has been given him, defames and reproaches the Venerable Body that endeavoured to reclaim him; since the Injured Reputation not of a few Members only, but of the whole Synod, calls for a Reply, it is necessary to shew things in their proper Colours, and to take off the False Glosses with which the Vindicator has caused his Reader.

It

THE PREFACE.

It is not my design to expose the Failings of any Person, but Truth is a rigid inflexible Thing, and has no Regard to Character or Station. And therefore, since the Vindicator has, as I have shewn, made it necessary to have the Truth declared, his Friends must blame Him and not Me, if any thing be here related that bears hard upon them.

I doubt not but that the Reader will wonder that the Author of a Letter containing such gross Absurdities, such notorious Falshoods, and such scandalous Reflections upon the Convocation, should meet with any One Member of that Body so much his Friend, as to endeavour to Screen him from the Punishment due to such Base and Unworthy Practices. And indeed had not the Letter-Writer been in a very particular manner Patronized by His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant, and Countenanced by His Grace the Arch-Bishop of Dublin, I can scarce think that any one single Member would have stood up in Vindication of him.

What Ends or Views those few Gentlemen who appeared in his Favour might have had, it is not for me to determine; But I think I may say that those, who in the worst of Times shew'd such a tender Regard for the Privileges of their Body, and who Protested against a most Notorious Violation of them, could be influenced by nothing, but a Sense of their Duty, and the Obligation they lay under to preserve inviolably those Rights which they found handed down to them from their Predecessors. The

The Protestors particularly could not but be sensible that what they did would be very far from recommending them to the Favour of Persons then in Power; And yet they little expected that any Gentlemen of the Long Robe should so precipitately give an Opinion concerning the Actings of a Parliamentary Body; and, without any regard to our Constitution, and the Liberties that are essential to it, give under their Hands, That what the Protestors had done in Convocation, was Derogatory to the Queen's Prerogative, and that they ought to be Prosecuted at Law for it.

My Lords the Bishops have already declared their Thoughts in this Matter; For I find by their Journal of August 5. 1709, That they came to a Resolution to make Application to the House of Lords (the proper Judicature to which in such Cases we ought to resort) complaining of a Breach of Privilege of Convocation committed by the Attorney and Solicitor-General and the Two Sergeants, for giving an Opinion as they had done in this Case. And Others may possibly think themselves concerned to consider where a Precedent of this Nature may end; For if a few Lawyers may thus take upon them to Determine concerning the Proceedings of a Body which is acknowledged to be a part of the Constitution, and is summoned to Parliament by the QUEEN'S Writ, and is intitled to the Privileges of Parliament, may not Others (in case hereafter an Arbitrary Go-

ment should arise) take the same Liberty with Members of either House of Parliament, especially if the Posture of Affairs should happen to be such, as that they may hope not only for Impunity but Reward for so doing? Encroachments of this Nature grow by insensible Degrees, and it is an easie Transition from making free with the Privileges of one Body to attempt those of another.

By the use of such a Liberty as this, how easie would it have been for my Lord Tyrconnel to have overturn'd the Constitution under a Colour of Law, and to have terrified any one from daring to oppose Him? For had a Convocation been sitting in his Government, and any of the Members had Protested against such Insults as might then probably have been made upon their Privileges, I doubt not but He would have found an Attorney and a Solicitor and Two Sergeants at Law, who would have given it under their Hands, that such an Act was Derogatory to the Royal Prerogative, and that the Protestors ought to be Prosecuted for it. But I hope no Member of the same Body would have been so complying, as to join in such an unnatural Accusation, and to conceive the Reverend Protestors to have thereby made a most dangerous Encroachment upon the Royal Prerogative in Causes Ecclesiastical.

The late Protestors were much surpris'd to hear that they had encroached upon the QUEEN's Prerogative; It is a Crime that they least expected to be

THE PREFACE.

V

be laid to their Charge: They know their Constitution better, and have a greater Regard for it than to weaken That which is its great Support. And I verily believe, that, if the Hearts of Men could be known, it would appear that the Protestors have many Enemies, for no other Reason, but because they are sincere and zealous Assertors of that very Prerogative which they are here accused of having invaded.

How it has happened that They have not yet been proceeded against, I know not. Most certain it is that a violent Prosecution was designed; and to add some Weight to the Opinion that had been given against Them on this side the Water, it was industriously reported, that the Judges in England had confirmed it with Theirs; which, tho' now, upon enquiry, I find to be utterly groundless, yet then, in order to intimidate the Protestors, it was affirm'd with so much Confidence, that there was scarce any room to doubt the Truth of it. However none of these Threats and Menaces had their intended Effect; The Protestors had a good Conscience to support them under the worst that might happen: Nor can I hear that any One of them made the least step towards a Submission, or an Acknowledgment of any Guilt; No, tho' their Accusers were in the greatest Power, and They had nothing but their Innocence to depend upon, yet they were willing to have their pretended Crime brought

brought publicly upon the Stage, and were ready, if their Constitution must sink, to sink with it.

Happy for them it was that their Lordships the Bishops took their Case so much to Heart, as to depute two of their own Members to go into England, and to lay the whole Proceedings of Convocation in this Matter in a due and proper Light before HER MAJESTY. They might otherwise have been thought by HER MAJESTY to be as bad as no doubt they were Represented: And as my Lords the Bishops took effectual Care to have them truly represented to their SOVEREIGN, so I humbly presume that the following Papers will set them right in the Opinion of their Fellow Subjects, if there be any who still harbour any hard or unkind thoughts of them.

The Reader may perhaps think that I have given both him and my self more trouble than was necessary, in Replying so particularly to all the Impertinencies contained in the Libel. But it must be remembred, that how contemptible so ever the Libeller may be in himself, yet he has Supporters and Abettors of a greater Magnitude, who, unless he be confuted in every thing, will venture to affirm that he is answered in nothing. I have therefore followed him thro' all his Shiftings and Turnings, and have shewn his Calumnies to be groundless, his Representation of Facts to be False, and his Wit to be Scurrilous. His Arguing also I have
shewn

shewn to be unconvincing, as often as he has happen'd to deviate into Reasoning out of his proper Province, which is Asserting.

Indeed, had he been as Able in Proving as he has been Bold in Asserting; had his Power kept pace with his Inclination, the Clergy would have been rendred the most contemptible Body of Men in the Nation. But his feeble Attacks have done Them Credit, and have rather added to their Reputation than taken from it; for since they have been able to abide the Tryal, they appear in the greater Lustre for having undergone the Scrutiny of such a nice and prying Observer.

Had I taken notice of all the particular Falsehoods contain'd in the Vindicator's Narrative, it would have been such a Dry, Tedious, Unentertaining Work, as few Readers would have had the Patience to bear with; and therefore I have been as short as possibly I could upon that Head; however the Reader has instances enough to enable him to form a Right Judgment of the Veracity, and Integrity of the Vindicator.

It is now to be hoped, since Her Majesty, out of Her great Goodness, has, to the Universal Joy of the whole Nation, been pleas'd to restore His Grace the Duke of ORMOND to the Government over us, that we shall once again enjoy the Halcyon Days of Peace and Unity, for which this same Convocation was heretofore so remarkable

ble under the happy Influence of His Grace's Protection. It was to His Grace's Mediation with Her Majesty, that we owed the Restitution of our Right to Meet and Act in Convocation; nor were we ever Prorogued sitting the Parliament, as we have been since: how regularly, I leave it to my Superiours to examine. During His Grace's Government, we were as a Family at Unity with it self, and effectually made good the Promise that was very early made to His Grace, 'of preserving a good Agreement and Unanimity among our Selves, as also an United Zeal for the Glory of God, and Her Majesties Service.

And altho', since the Removal of his Grace from being Ruler over us, some Warm Debates have happen'd in the Lower House, occasioned by the Letter-Writer, yet we are still so happy as to be able to say, that we have never had any the least Difference with their Lordships of the Upper House. For the Behaviour of the Lower Clergy has ever been so Dutiful and Respectful to my Lords the Bishops: and such a Tender and Affectionate concern have their Lordships shewn for the Rights and Privileges of the Lower Clergy, that we can 'bless God for the perfect Unity and Harmony between the Two Houses. Which, being so conspicuous, We look upon to be a great Security to the National Church, a great Discouragement to Her profest Enemies, and a great Vexation and Disappointment to the more close and dangerous Underminers of our excellent Constitution.

A
REPLY,
 TO A
VINDICATION
 OF THE
LETTER, &c.

SECT. I.

Being an Introduction to the following Papers.

UPON occasion of certain Disputes in the Lower House of Convocation of *England*, concerning the Rights and Privileges of that House, the Convocation of *Ireland* happen'd to be mention'd. It was Asserted by some, and Denied by others, that we in *Ireland* were in actual possession of several Usages, then claim'd by the Lower House in *England*. Upon this some Members writ into *Ireland* to know the Truth of these Matters: Archdeacon *Percivale*, amongst others, was writ to, and he return'd an Account of the Matter of Fact, as it really was. But his Relation did not meet with any Credit from those, who asserted that others from *Ireland* had Represented things in a quite different manner. The Archdeacon was writ to again, and still persisted in the Truth of what he had written before; and gave leave to have his Name mention'd, in hopes that they who contradicted him, would name those who had given them their Intelligence; but still the same Persons contradicted him, without naming their Correspondents. Some time after, Archdeacon *Percivale* happen'd to be at *London*: And was then appeal'd to in Person, for what he had before written, and he still asserted the Truth as before.

He was informed moreover that it had been reported, that we were so far from enjoying those Usages, that we were miserably divided amongst our selves concerning them. This the Archdeacon was able to assure them was an unworthy Aspersion upon our Convocation, and could not be affirm'd by any that had the least regard to Truth or Justice. Mr. Higgins, who was also then at London, and known to be a Member of the Convocation of Ireland, was appeal'd to likewise: and gave the same Account of our Affairs as the Archdeacon had done, and with the same Success.

In short, since nothing less would satisfy some Persons, the Lower House thought fit to Invite these Two Members into their House, there to give a Relation of such Things as were then thought necessary to be known.

The Archdeacon well knew, that, should he decline going to the House after such a fair Invitation, it would be suggested that what he had before asserted by Letter was false, since he would not dare to assert the same thing publicly, and above board: And both Mr. Higgins and He were willing to make use of so fair an opportunity of washing off those Blemishes, with which some false Friend or other had aspersed the Convocation of Ireland.

They appeared in the House the 4th of February, 1706. and gave an Account by word of Mouth, of such things as were desired of them, which at the request of the House, they afterward reduced into Writing, and presented to the House the 19th of the same Month.

This seemed to be such an Innocent and Necessary Action, that the Two Members never expected to hear any more of it. But in July 1707, (about a year and a half after this had happen'd) the Two Members being absent, the One in England, the Other at Cashell, Dr. Lambert brought a heavy Accusation against them in the Lower House of Convocation in Ireland, for having done something in England that was Destructive to the Rights of the House. And he usher'd in his Complaint after such a manner, as if he thought the very Being of the Convocation was at Stake.

The Doctor was at this time, as to Convocation Affairs, in full Credit; He had not as yet appear'd in those Colours, which he has so publicly shewn himself in since; Nay he was so far from being suspected to be a Betrayal of the Rights of the Convocation, that he was Remarkable for nothing more

more than his Zeal for them. Whatsoever he said or did, *Rights* and *Privileges* seem'd to be uppermost in his Thoughts; *Rights* and *Privileges* were the Burthen of all his Speeches; his Duty to the Members of the *Upper House*, and his Affection to those of the *Lower*, all seem'd to give way to this predominant Zeal for *Rights* and *Privileges*. This induced many to believe that the Doctor had no other end in this his Accusation, than to preserve those *Rights* which he seem'd to have always had so much at Heart: and they could not but think that it was some high Violation of them, that could produce such a Noisy Complaint.

But when the *Archdeacon* appeared in the House, and laid the whole of that Affair before them, it then presently appear'd what a Frivolous Accusation had been brought against him. To be short, he produced a Copy of the Paper which Mr. *Higgins* and He had deliver'd into the *Lower House* in England, and desired it might be Examined in the Committee, and it was accordingly Examined and underwent the nicest Scrutiny. And when a Report of it was made to the House, the House agreed with the Committee, in resolving upon each Paragraph, that it was a *Just and True Representation of the Matters contain'd in it*. And also that the Two Members by going to the *Lower House* in England, and there making this Representation in their private Capacity, had not done any thing prejudicial to the Honour or Privileges of the House.

Nay, what the Two Members had done appear'd to be so necessary to Vindicate the Convocation from those vile Aspersions which had been Clandestinely cast upon it, that Mr. *Griffith* (now a fast Friend of Dr. *Lamberts*) moved, that the Thanks of the House might be given to them, for having acted as they did; Nor was his Motion opposed by any One; but the Archdeacon desired that any Compliment of that Nature might be waved, being satisfied with the Justice that the House had done him.

Thus ended this weighty Accusation, and it was thought that this Affair was quite over, nor did any one expect to hear of it any more; When to the surprize of all, in the Year 1708 (above a Twelve-month after the House had acquitted the Two Members) Out comes a Letter (Printed in a Pamphlet intitled *Particulars detected*) pretending to give an Account of the Convocation of Ireland: in which this whole Af-

Fair is brought again upon the Stage, and not only the *Two Members*, but the whole *Convocation* are Treated with the utmost Indignity and Contempt: Abundance of idle Stories are told to render us Vile and Ridiculous in the Eyes of the World. The great Guardian of our Rights is now become an Advocate against them; there is hardly One that He will allow us any Title to; and all that we have enjoyed hitherto are Represented to have been nothing but Encroachments and Usurpations. Nay, He will not allow us to be so much as a *Convocation*, but both *Upper* and *Lower-House* are Represented to be an unlawful Assembly met together without any Legal or Competent Authority.

As many as saw this Letter were amazed to find so many Falsehoods related with so much Confidence, and such known Rights impugned with so little Reason: And because some men are apt to think a Writing unanswerable unless some Answer be given to it, therefore a certain Member thought fit to make a few *Remarks* upon the Letter, in which he has shewn the Letter Writer's exceptions against the *Two Members* to be weak and trifling, the disgraceful Stories which he has told of the *Convocation* to be False and Groundless; and our Rights and Priviledges to be fixt on a firm and sound Bottom, notwithstanding all the little Artifices that he has used to undermine them.

And because the greatest part of this Dispute between the Letter Writer and the *Remarker* consisted of Facts affirmed by One and deny'd by the other to have been Transacted in the *Lower-House*, the *Remarker* therefore thought fit to appeal to the House for the Truth in Dispute, who must be allowed to be the only proper Judges in this Case; and the House did accordingly appoint a Committee to examine it.

Dr. *Lambert* Conscious to himself of what would be the Success of such an Appeal, laboured to hinder the Committee from taking Cognizance of it; he first beg'd and intreated them to put it off, he then told them that they had no Authority to examine or censure any thing that was in Print, and at last he Huff'd and Threatned after a very undecent manner, which the Members were willing to impute to some discomposure and disorder of Mind. But what could the House do? they had done Dr. *Lambert* Justice in examining into his Complaint against the *Two Members*, and could they now refuse the same Justice against him? Besides they

they saw themselves most Contemptuously treated in this Letter, abundance of False disgraceful Stories told with the greatest assurance, and their known Rights and Privileges invaded publickly. Had they been silent under these Reproaches, would not the World have thought them to be Just? or, would it not be imagin'd that they had no Title to their Privileges if they had not thought them worth Asserting and Vindicating when attack'd? The most inconsiderable Society takes the alarm when their very Being and Constitution is assaulted; and much more so when this Treacherous work is the Business of one of their own Members. How then can the *Vindicator* or any of his Friends wonder that the *Lower-House of Convocation* should think fit to spend a few days in the Vindication of those Rights, which in Honour and Conscience they are bound to Maintain, and to hand down to their Successors with the same Integrity as they have receiv'd them from their Predecessors?

The House therefore, thinking themselves obliged to take Cognizance of the Letter, appointed a Committee to examine it, who with great care and assiduity went thro' it; and besides several just Censures which they passed against particular parts of it (as the Reader will find in the Sequel of these Papers) They voted it to be a *False and Scandalous Libel, tending to create Jealousies and Misunderstandings between the Two Houses of Convocation, designed to make this National Synod appear an illegal Assembly, to destroy the known Rights and undoubted Privileges of the Lower-House, and to misrepresent in a very reflecting manner the Bishops and Clergy of this Kingdom.* And they resolved farther, *That if it shall hereafter appear, that any Member of the House has been the Author of this Libel, he ought to be proceeded against with the severest Censures that the House can inflict.*

As these Votes (had there been no other) are sufficient to Justifie the severest Remarks that could be made upon the Letter, so one would think that they should Silence the Letter Writer for ever.

After such a Brand as is here fix'd upon him by such a Venerable Body, a modest Man would be glad to hide his Face for ever, and retire from the World in Shame and Confusion; at least he would retract his Error, acknowledge his Wickedness, beg Pardon, and promise Repentance. Had the *Letter-Writer* done this, it might have so wrought upon the Goodness and Compassion of the Members as to have forgiven him. But this

Gentleman

Gentleman is above this, he is harden'd, and so far from Repenting that he dares to appear upon the Stage again, and in the Shape of a *Vindicator*, endeavours to justify all those notorious Falshoods which were so evidently Proved upon him. Let us see with what Success.

SECT. II.

In which is consider'd what the Vindicator has said concerning the Accusation brought by Dr. Lambert against the Two Members.

THE *Vindicator* seems so angry with the Two Members for making the Representation, with the House for ratifying it, and with the *Remarker* for shewing the weakness of his Exceptions against it, that he can't help venting his Passion against them all in almost every Page of his Pamphlet. I shall endeavour to bring all that he has said together into this Section. He denies that he was the Man that writ those Scandalous Letters that occasioned the Representation; how far his Word ought to go after what has been proved against him, I leave the Reader to judge. Indeed the Persons, to whom those Letters were written, did not think fit to quote their Authors, and therefore the *Remarker* was not able to charge the Doctor directly with it. But if he never Writ them, how came he to be so particularly concern'd in this Controversy? How came it to be his particular Business to invalidate the Representation made by the Two Members, if it did not run Counter to Any made by him? Certainly he will not, after his Letter and Vindication, pretend to have a greater Regard for the Honour of the House than others; nor can the bare making of a Representation offend him, since he has vouchsafed to Represent the Transactions of Convocation, in as publick a manner as even the Two Members.

Pag. 1. The *Remarker*, he says, introduces a new account of Mr. Percivale's and Mr. Higgins's going to the Lower-House in England. Be it new or old, the *Remarker* still Affirms that it is the Account that was always given. But he says, that a more trifling Account could not be given by the meanest Letter Writer. Be it so; if it be but True, that is all that the *Remarker* is concern'd for.

for. And indeed, as he relates it, not in the *Remarker*, but in his own words, 'tis trifling enough.

The *Remarker* had said that the Two Members were appealed *Pag. 2.*
to in the Lower House of Convocation in England, concerning the

Truth of some Facts which they were well able to know and to decide.
To this the *Vindicator* Replies. The Representatives of the Na- *Pag. 2.*
tional Church, who had appealed to her Majesty in Person, do now

condescend to appeal to Mr. Percivale and Mr. Higgins; That
Dispute, in which the greatest Men of England had either interposed
or interested themselves, is now left to the decision of Two pri-
vate Members of the Convocation of Ireland. But is the *Vindi-*

cator in Earnest? Did the Lower House of England ever Appeal
to her Majesty concerning the usages of the Lower House in Ire-

land? Or did the greatest Men of England ever interpose or inte-
rest themselves in that part of the Dispute? Certainly they did

not; and if so, 'tis as foreign from his Argument, as disrespect-
ful to her Majesty, to bring her Royal name into this Con-

troversy? And will not the Reader think himself imposed up-
on by the *Vindicator*, who Represents her Majesty and the

greatest men of England interesting themselves in the same
Appeal that was made to the Two Members? So much of the

Dispute as They were appeal'd to for, (*viz.* whether such and
such things were so or so Transacted in the House of which

they were Members, and of which they could not be Ignorant)
I think, I may say, without breach of Modesty, that they

were more able to decide than any Person in England what-
soever. Had they taken upon themselves the Decision of

any other part of the Dispute, they would have been Im-
pertinent and Presuming, and no doubt would have been u-

sed accordingly.

The *Remarker* had said with a great deal of truth, that the *Pag. 3.*
Credit and Reputation of the Irish Convocation was call'd in

question: that the Two Houses were represented to be broken into
Divisions and Parties about their Usages: and that so fair an Op-

portunity ought not to be neglected of doing the whole Convocation
of Ireland Justice, and of washing off those blemishes, which such as

the Letter-Writer had thrown upon them; Which the *Vindica-*
tor answers, by charging the Two Members with having thrown

two great Blemishes, and two notorious Affronts upon the
Convocation of Ireland.

The first great Blemish is this, that two of their own Mem- *Pag. 3.*
bers should have so little regard for them, or undervalue them so

that they should have so much to say of them, and so much to say
that

that Degree, as to dare to represent their Proceedings without their knowledge to a publick Assembly. To which I answer; That when a Body of Men are publicly aspersed, it is the Duty of every Member to do them Justice, both publickly and privately. And this is so far from having a little regard or undervaluing the Body, that it shews the greatest Regard and value for them imaginable, and this tho' done without their Knowledge.

- Pag. 3. The second great Blemish is, for the Convocation of Ireland to be drag'd in involuntary into the Disputes of England. And is the Convocation drag'd into any Disputes of England? who but the Vindicator wou'd have the Face to affirm this? I know of no Dispute at all that the Convocation of Ireland have upon their hands, except this with the Letter-Writer, and his Vindicator. Supposing the Claims and Pretensions of the Lower-House of England, to be ever so precarious; What is that to us? Are our Usages founded upon theirs? Are we not upon our own bottom? called by Writs of our own? And does not the Vindicator himself assign many reasons, why we may have a Title to several privileges, which our Brethren in England may not? How then can a bare Narrative of our Proceedings drag us into the Disputes of England? This indeed was that which he made such Moan about in his pretious Letter, and what said the Committee to that part of it? I suppose they must be allow'd to know whether they are engaged in a Dispute or no; and yet they came to a Resolution; *Nemine Contradicente, That the Lower-House of Convocation of Ireland, has no way concerned itself in the Controversy between the Two Houses of Convocation in England.* And so much for his two great blemishes, greater than which, he says, could not be thrown upon the Convocation. And now for his two notorious Affronts.
- Par. 39. The first is charged upon some Members on this side the Water, in that they should write every Post into England, what was transacted in the House. How is it that he knows that any Member writ every Post into England? Or had any Member done so, did the House ever make any Order, forbidding their Members to write by the Post of what was transacted in the House? if any such Order was made, then certainly they may be said to have affronted the House, who disobeyed it. But if no such Order was made, then I hope every Member was at liberty to write every Post, if he thought fit. Or did any Member send by the Post, any false, injurious, abusive accounts of our affairs? Did they lay open the wrong steps and over-sights of either

either on both Houses? Did any one represent Quarrels, that never happen'd, and Disputes that were never heard of? If any such thing as this can be charged upon any Member, let the *Vindicator* name him; As for the *Remarker*, I can answer for him, that he sent over no account, but what was both True and Honourable.

The second notorious Affront comes from 'tother side the Water, and consists in this, that some or other from thence censured our Proceedings, and gave new Orders which were handed about, how to manage for the future. Now I would be glad to know who these Magisterial Gentlemen are, who thus take upon them to censure our Proceedings: And who they are that correspond with them; the *Remarker* can safely declare that he has had no such Correspondents. He is one of many who would scorn to receive Orders from any, but the House of which he is a Member: And he is so far from tamely suffering a stranger to censure our Proceedings, that he can't bear it even in a Member, and that the *Letter-Writer* knows full well. I wish the *Vindicator* would tell us some of those *New Orders* which he speaks of; No doubt he has seen them: He says they were handed about, so that they can be on secret. In his next *Vindication* perhaps he will produce them. Pag. 3.

Yet after all, says the *Vindicator*, what if this fine story of being appeal'd to, and doing Justice, and reconciling differences, and washing of Blemishes, &c. be all mere grimace and empty trifling with the World? For if that Paper of Mr. Percivale and Mr. Higgins, were drawn up a considerable time before they were appeal'd to, and were handed about a great Colledge in Oxford, and read by many there long before their appearing in the Lower-House at London, and answering such questions as they pretend it was writ in answer to; then what becomes of all these fair and glittering pretences to justify the Paper, and the Occasion of it? Yet all this is charged upon him in that very Pamphlet, which the *Remarker* had before him to answer, and not the least notice taken of it. It is here insinuated that the Paper of the Two Members was drawn up a considerable time before they were appeal'd to, and was read in Oxford long before their appearing in the Lower-House at London, and it is asserted that the Pamphlet which the *Remarker* had before him to answer, had charged this upon them. And all this is told with so much Assurance, that no Reader, unacquainted with the *Vindicator's* way

way of writing, would in the least doubt of the Truth of it. And yet it so happens, that not one word of this is true. Neither was the Paper drawn up *before* the Two Members appeared in the Lower-House at London, nor does the Pamphlet (which the *Remarker* had before him to answer) say that it was.

The Two Members were *appealed* to, and appeared in the Lower-House at London the 4th of February, as may be seen in the first Paragraph of their Paper; the remaining part of that and the next Day, they jointly put into writing what they had before deliver'd by word of Mouth: And on the 6th of February, Mr. *Percivale* went to Oxford. And when he was there, he was not shy of shewing the Paper to any that had the Curiosity to see it, and it may probably be read by many in that great Colledge which the *Vindicator* hints at. But that 'twas drawn up *before* they were *appeal'd* to, the *Vindicator* is challeng'd to prove: and to name any one Man in the World, that saw it *before* their appearing in the House at London. Had this been charged upon him in the Pamphlet, which the *Remarker* had before him to answer, (as the *Vindicator* with his usual sincerity alledges) He had not suffer'd it to pass without taking notice of it. But that Pamphlet asserts no such thing; all that is there said, is, *that this account of the Irish Convocation was shewn in Oxford some time before it was produced in the House.* And that may very well be; for it was not produced in the House, till February 19, as may be seen in that very Pamphlet, to which *Partiality Detected* pretends to be an answer. I hope this Gentleman will in his next *Vindication* name some of those many, who saw this Paper of the Two Members, before their appearing in the Lower-House at London, i. e. before the 4th of February, 1708.

Partiality Detected, p. 107.
Proceedings in the Convocation, 1705.
pag. 26.

Par. 40.

The Letter-Writer had said, that when the Lower House of 1661, had a mind to send an Agent into England, for some Affairs of the Church, they first ask'd leave of their Lordships to send, and then pray their Approbation of the Person. This the *Remarker* has shewn not at all to concern the Case of the Two Members, who never took upon themselves to be Agents for the Church. Should any Member of the House of Commons here happen to be in England, and there tell any Man, or any Body of Men, for their Information, what was done in Parliament the last Session, would he thereby take upon himself to be

be an *Agent* for the Publick, and be obliged to produce his Commission as such? And yet nothing more than this, have the *Two Members* done in respect of the *Convocation*. But how does the *Vindicator* Represent the Answer, which the *Remarker* gave to this trifling Objection? He Represents it thus, *Pag. 5.*
What is this, says the Remarker, to the Case of the Two Members? Did they take upon themselves to be Agents for the Affairs of the Church?—Will a Writer of the Remarker's size bring himself off by saying that the Affairs of Convocation, are no Affairs of the Church, or that they have not acted because they had no Commission?—Yet this is all the Answer, he Vouchsafes to give to that Quotation out of the Books of 1661.

Now, First, The *Remarker* no where says, that the *Affairs of Convocation, are no Affairs of the Church*; He says, *they did not take upon themselves to be Agents for the Affairs of the Church*; and if he had said, *for the Affairs of the Convocation, it had been equally True and as pertinent to his Argument.* Nor, Secondly, does he say, that *they had, not acted because they had no Commission*; He says indeed, that *they did not act as Agents, because they neither had nor pretended to have any Commission.* Not, Thirdly, (had he said all this) is *this all the Answer he Vouchsafed to give to that Quotation*; as the Reader may see, if he pleases to Peruse the 6th Page of the *Remarks*.

When the *Archdeacon* came to Town, upon the Accusation brought against him, he own'd publicly what he had done, produced a Copy of the Paper in the House, and desired that it might be examin'd. But when he appear'd at the Committee, he expected, as is usual in such Cases, that his Accuser would impeach him Face to Face: And that the Committee would demand the Paper of him. This the *Remarker* has affirm'd, and the *Vindicator* endeavours to prove it false from the *Remarker* himself. And thus he goes about it.

If, says he, the *Archdeacon* had own'd all this Matter to the *Pag. 19.* House, as soon as he came to Town, undoubtedly he had done the same at the Committee. That does not follow; did he disown it at the Committee? Had the Committee put the Question to him, he had own'd it, and had told them every thing as frankly as he had done before in the House. But was it the *Archdeacon's* Business to begin the Affair? No certainly, he ought to wait to see what his Accuser had to say against him; especially since he had no Reason to doubt but the Doctor

was ready, and prepared against him. The Committee might have taken *pro Confesso* his owning and producing publicly the Paper in the House if they had thought fit: But since the Accuser, who was present, refused to make a Charge against him, they did not think it of Moment enough to give themselves any Trouble about it.

Pag. 21. Another Argument a-kin to the former is this; *that Dr. Lambert writ to London very pressingly for a Copy, and it can't well be imagined, that He should give himself, or his Friends in England, so much Trouble to no manner of purpose, as it must certainly have been, if the Archdeacon had so frankly own'd the whole matter, at his first coming to the House. And must Dr. Lambert's being Impertinent, and Writing to London, when there was no occasion for it, be urged as an Argument to prove the Remarker inconsistent with himself? Every Body who knows how Officious the good Doctor has been to shew his Zeal (not to serve the Convocation, as is evident from his Letter, but some private ends of his own) will easily imagine, that he might do as much as this, tho' there was no Necessity for it. He goes on and says, that a Copy after much searching for the Books (which were at last found in the Custody of one of the Archdeacon's principal Friends) was obtained, and sent to the Doctor, and has been shewn to several here, and is now in the hands of a very eminent Person in this Kingdom. He would insinuate here that the Archdeacon's Friends were loath to let him have a Copy, whereas I am very well perswaded, that none of his Friends were the least backward in Communicating Copies to any that had a desire to have them: Nay, it is one great Complaint of the Letter Writer, that they at last made it so Publick as to Print it. And if the Books were in the Custody of any Friend of the Archdeacon, (who this Friend is, the Archdeacon knows not, nor is it worth his while to guess) I suppose they ought of Right to be there, otherwise the Lower-House of England, would know the reason how they came to be placed out of the Custody of the proper Person. And as for his mentioning, that it has been shewn to several here, and is now in the Hands of a very eminent Person in this Kingdom, it is full as impertinent as his Writing for it, and makes nothing at all to the point in hand. But I suppose he hooks it in, that the Reader may think, that he has some very Eminent Person that elpouses him in this Kingdom; whereas I can't think that any Eminent Person would Countenance*

tenance One, whom the Clergy in *Convocation* have shewn to be Guilty of such Base and Unworthy Practices.

But, he says, it happen'd most Unluckily, that for want of its Ibid. being own'd at first, the Committee sat a second time. To whom did it happen Unluckily? Not to the *Two Members*; for the Committee pass'd very Honourable Votes in favour of them: And therefore if it happened Unluckily to any One, it was to the *Accuser*, who was so far from compassing his ends, that he was fain to sit down under a Disappointment. But still he complains of the *Accusers* being put into the Chair, and says, the *Remarker* has used him Scurvily, in saying he thrust himself into it, before the House had well order'd it; And he appeals to Ibid. every man there, except the *Archdeacon* and his *Confidants*. I suppose by the *Archdeacons Confidants*, he means all those who concurred in those Votes that were so much to the *Archdeacon's* Honour; and if so, then he has left very few to be Appealed to. The *Remarker* still affirms, that his being in *that*, as well as in some other Chairs, was owing to his own Forwardness; and several Persons who remember this Affair perfectly well, assure me they can testify it.

But, he says, it is hard to imagine what Ambitious aim Dr. Pag. 22. Lambert could have by courting one of the meanest Chairs that ever was appointed by the House. If it was the meanest Chair, it was accordingly filled. But pray, who was the Occasion of its being appointed at all; was it not to satisfy his clamorous importunate Accusation? What aim he had in officiously thrusting himself into it, I know not; sure I am, it was not to serve the *Archdeacon*, as he boasts that he served Pag. 11. an *Archbishop* in another Chair. Now I desire to know, is the Chair capable of serving any Cause that is brought before the Committee, or is it not? If it be; then the *Archdeacon* and not Dr. Lambert, has reason to complain, that the *Accuser* was put into a place of Influence: But if the Chair has no manner of Influence; how then comes it, that he claims Merit from a great *Archbishop*, for Services, which he saucily Ibid. pretends to have done his Grace, by being in Two Chairs?

In his next Paragraph it is difficult to find what he would be at: He is angry that the House thought fit to enter into the Merits of the Paper of the *Two Members*, which notwithstanding what he has written, he seems to allow to be true; for this, says he (*i. e.* that the Paper might be examined as to the Truth of the Facts contained in it) was indeed all Pag. 23. that

that the Archdeacon aim'd at. But could the Archdeacon be in his Senses and yet aim at this, if he had not been sure that his Paper was true, and would bear an Examination?

The *Kindicator* still charges the House with *Incongruity* in Voting that the *Two Members* had acted in their *private Capacity* what he says they did in their *Convocation Capacity*. The *Remarker* one would have thought had said enough to clear this point in p. 30. where amongst many other things, he says, That *had the Two Members done any thing in the Name and by the Authority of the House, they had then acted in a publick Capacity*. To which the *Kindicator* learnedly replies; But may not a Man already Invested with a publick Character or Capacity, abuse that Character, and act in Derogation of it? Pag. 24. He may, and what then? May not a Judge act against Law, and contrary to his Commission? Yes he may, still what is this to the *Two Members*? A Man may sustain the publick Character of a Judge, and at the same time do many things in his *private Capacity*. Should a Judge after the Court is up, give a relation to any of his Friends, of what had been that day transacted in Court; I suppose in so doing he would act in his *private Capacity*, and yet he is a Judge still. Ibid. May not an Ambassador runcounter to the Authority and Instructions given him? Ibid. Yes he may: And can he be said when he does so, to act by the Authority of his Commission. Yes, he can; But since it is nothing to the purpose, I will grant him either side of the Question. These Cases do not at all concern the *Two Members*, for they have been so far from running counter to any Authority, or Instruction, or Commission given them, that they have own'd over and over, that they had no Authority, no Instructions, no Commission at all for what they did; or in other Words, that what they did was in their *private*, and not in any *publick Capacity*. Ibid. If a Member of either House of Parliament acts against the Honour, Interest, or Orders of his House, (he deserves to be severely punish'd). He certainly does not act in the Name, nor by Authority from the House. Certainly not; still what is this to the *Two Members*? Have they acted against the Honour, Interest or Orders of the House? Yet I desire to know in what Capacity such a Member must be punish'd, not sure in his *private Capacity*, for that is not under the Cognizance of either House; therefore it must be in his *publick*, i. e. his *Parliamentary Capacity*: Yes, they may Fine or Imprison his *private Person*, or they may Divest

Divest him of his publick Capacity by Expulsion. But the Remarker supposes every Man to act in his private Capacity, who has not a particular Order or Commission for every act he does. He does suppose it; every Member of Parliament or Convocation, when they act in that House, of which they are Members, has a particular Order or Commission for every act he does there: That which Impowers him to sit there, is his particular Order or Commission: but what any Member does without doors, he does in a private Capacity, not by virtue of that Order or Commission that Impowers him to sit in the House; otherwise no Member of Parliament or Convocation, can Eat, or Drink, or Walk, or Talk, but he must act in a publick Capacity. In a word a Convocation Capacity is as much a publick Capacity, while it continues, as any publick Officers can be; (I grant it, and it is a wise Observation) and though they, as well as other Officers may transact their own private Affairs, yet when they transact Affairs peculiar to their House, and that in a publick manner, to call this acting in their private Capacity, is not reconcilable to the usual Notions which obtain in the World of distinct Capacities. Should a Member tell what had been transacted in Convocation, in ever so publick a manner, either in a Coffee-House, or at the Market-Cross, this would still be an act done in his private Capacity, and is I think very reconcileable to the usual Notions which obtain of distinct Capacities. For he is graciously pleased to allow these publick Capacity-men, to transact their private Affairs (I suppose he would be understood, that such would be transacted in a private Capacity.) Now therefore I desire to know, if such a Man should tell in his own Private Family, what had been Transacted in Convocation, may this be lookt upon as a private Affair, and done in his private Capacity or no? I suppose he will allow this to be an act of his private Capacity. But should he go further and tell the same to his Neighbours, I suppose this would not alter the Capacity in which he acted; Nay, should he go farther still, and tell it to the whole Country, he would still act in the same Capacity as when he told it to his Wife and Children only. In short I think that no Member of any House, can properly be said to act in his publick Capacity, but either in the House, or by Virtue of some Order or Authority from the House. Thus the Remarker took Notice, that the *Prolocutor* Preach'd before my Lord-
 Ibid. Pag. 30.
 Lieutenant,

Lieutenant, and Printed his Sermon, and subscrib'd himself *Prolocutor of the Lower-House of Convocation*, and yet what he then did was in his *private Capacity*, since he did it not by any Order or Direction of the House; And all the Answer that the *Vindicator* thinks fit to give this is, that *it is so Trifling* Pag. 24. *as that it is not worth mentioning. I would only ask* (says he) *if he (the Prolocutor) had published any Convocation Proceedings, and subscrib'd them by that Title, in what Capacity he would then be judg'd to have Acted?* To which I Answer, that if he had publish'd all the Proceedings that ever had been Transacted in *Convocation*, and had set his Name and Title at full length to the History; yet still if he had no Order or Direction from the House for so doing, all this would be done by him in his *private Capacity*.

I hope the Reader will excuse it, that I have dwelt so long upon so plain a Case; but the Obstinacy and Perverseness of my Adversary makes it necessary, who in a Haughty and Insolent manner, still charges this Absurdity and *Incongruity* upon the House, notwithstanding all that has been said in the *Remarks* to convince him. Had the *Two Members* only been affected with this imputation, it had not been worth while to have troubled the Reader with so much about it; but since the Reputation of the whole House is attack'd, I thought it necessary to take the whole Argument to pieces, to shew where the Absurdity and *Incongruity* lay.

And now, can any impartial Man think that the *Letter-Writer* had any Reason to revive the Accusation, and to make such a Stir and Pother about it, as if the very Being of the Church and *Convocation* was concern'd in it? *Two Members* give a plain honest Account of things, that had been publickly Transacted in *Convocation*; And is this such a heinous Crime? *Ay, but they did it without consulting either the Bishops, who were then at London, or the House of which they were Members.* And yet the *Vindicator* owns that the *Letter-Writer*, who for this very reason accuses the *Two Members*, had neither the Leave of his own House, nor the Advice - Pag. 4. of the *Bishops*, in Publishing his Letter, which pretends to give an Account of *Convocation Affairs*, as much as the Paper of the *Two Members*. Can the same Fact under the same Circumstances, be a Crime in them, and not in him? Or has he only a Privilege to give an Account of *Convocation Affairs*

sairs without leave? But the Paper of the Two Members being made Publick, gave every Man a Right to censure it as he pleased; the Letter-Writer knew not that these Two Gentlemen had any Patent to preserve their publick Writings from being Examined or Inquired into. Happy would it have been for the Letter-Writer, if such a Patent could have been procured for him; it would very lately have done him signal Service. But I grant that every Man has a right to examine into a Paper made publick. He well knows that This of the Two Members was accordingly examin'd by the Lower House; and it seems it stood the Test, and was Voted by them to be a Just and True Representation: whereas his Letter writ in opposition to it, met with a quite different Fate. Allowing therefore, that he had a Right to Examine this Paper, yet what will he say for the Publishing the other Parts of his Letter, which had no manner of relation to the Examination of this Paper? How came he to tell of Broils and Divisions between the Two Houses about the Virger, and the Vice-Prolocutor, which were never heard of till his Letter gave an Account of them? How came he to tell the World of Wrong steps and Over-sights, which (had they really been such, as it has been proved they were not) it would have been his Duty, one would think, to have drawn a Veil over? And how came he to accuse the Synod of being an Unlawful Assembly, met together without the Writ that was necessary to form them into a Synod? Did the Paper which he claims to have a Right of Examining, lead him into an Examination of these things also? Has that Paper any one word about them? No, it is not so much as pretended. And therefore, had every one of his Idle Stories been strictly True (as every one of them is notoriously False) he ought by his own Principles to be condemn'd, for making a Representation of them, without leave from the House. For the only Reason that he gives, for giving any Account without leave, is the Right that he has to Examine a Paper in print; and certainly that Reason will not justify him, in giving an account of such things as are not in that Paper, nor have any the least relation to it.

The Vindicator indeed says, that the Letter-Writer has meddled no farther with the Affairs of the Convocation of Ireland, than just what was necessary to expose the weakness and emptiness of that Pageant, as he Rhetorically calls the Paper of the Two Members. How then came he to tell the story of the Virger,

-D

the

- the *Vice-Prolocutor*, and the *Provincial Writ*? Had all that he has said upon these points been True, would not the *Pageant* be as strong and as full as before, since not one word of it has any manner of Relation or Dependance upon those things? He might have told a Story of the Emperor of *China*, or the Czar of *Muscovy*, and it would have equally affected that *Paper*. And therefore I fear that every Impartial Reader, without *Usurping the peculiar Prerogative of that God who is the searcher of all Hearts*, will be so uncharitable, as to think that all those False and Scandalous Stories were told, to render the *Convocation* as Vile and Contemptible as was possible. *Manet altâ mente repostum Judicium Paridis*—
- Pag. 15. That he who had the good Fortune to be thought as useful a Member as the Remarker: He who has drawn up an Address solely, and can sometimes Write consistently; that has been in the Chair of Two Committees, in which he had an opportunity of doing an Archbishop Justice, if not some Service; He whom the Lower House Honoured, by giving him a large share in their Favour, and in most of the Debates and Transactions of the House, and in drawing up so many of their most important Affairs; Who was always above being Corrupted, or Frightened into a betraying the Rights of the Lower House; Who had the Honour of being frequently Commanded by the House to draw up many of their Papers, and the good Fortune to meet with their Approbation of most that he drew; that He I say, should have so little Credit amongst them, as not to be believed upon his Word, that the Two Members deserved to be censured: This Usage no doubt deserved such treatment as the *Convocation* has met with from the *Letter-Writer*. And since the Clergy have been so ungrateful as to shew no respect to his great Merits and Qualifications; since they have disappointed him in so important a Point; He hopes to make himself Friends of the Mammon of Unrighteousness, and to procure himself a Character at the expence of theirs, who have used him with so little respect. And now having done with him as an *Accuser*, I come to consider him as an *Historian*.
- Pag. 3. Pag. 7. Pag. 11. Pag. 12. Pag. 22. Pag. 30. Ibid.

S E C T. III.

In which is considered what the Vindicator has said, as to the Facts reported by the Two Members, to have been Transacted in the Lower House of Convocation.

AS the Vote which the *Lower House* passed in favour of the *Two Members*, that they had not done any thing prejudicial to the Honour or Privileges of the House, would have been a sufficient Answer to all that has been urged against them, upon the Topick of Accusation: So the other Vote that their Paper was a *Just and true Representation*, is a fair Answer to all that can be urged against them, in point of Fact. However, as I have already considered every thing that has been brought, to justify the Accusation: So I will now Examine into the Particulars of what the *Vindicator* has said in relation to the Facts.

The first point that offended the *LetterWriter* was, what the *Two Members* had said, in relation to the *Præmunientes Clause*; that the *Clergy* elected and return'd by Virtue of that Clause, deferr'd choosing a Prolocutor, and proceeding to business, 'till the Reception of the Provincial Writ. This the *Letter-Writer* could not deny to be True; and yet he calls it, the most insincere and partial Account that can be given. And the Reason he gives for those hard terms is, because they only say the *Clergy* deferr'd choosing, &c. as if they thought, they had full Power to do it.

The *Remarker* denies, that the Word *deferr'd* implies so much; the *Vindicator* affirms it. And thus, as he says, Our difference seems to be upon the construction of a Word; whether he that is said to defer the doing of any thing, must not be supposed to have that thing in his Power to do, which he defers. And thus he illustrates his Argument; If a Man defers a Visit, it implies that he might have visited, and can do it when he pleases; if a man in health defers rising in a morning, it imports that he may rise, if he does not voluntarily defer it; But if a Man has the Gout or a Fever, he can't be said to defer rising, but to be un-

der an Incapacity of doing it. Thus this nice and subtil Reasoner—— Now, in order to settle this weighty Controversy, we must distinguish upon the word *Power*, which implies either *Natural Abilities*, or *Legal Authority*. If he takes *Power* in the former signification of the word; his Proposition is true, but not to the purpose: if in the latter; it is to the purpose, but not true. He will have it, that, if it could properly be said, that the House *deferr'd* proceeding to Business, before the reception of the *Provincial Writ*, this absur'd consequence would follow; that they must be supposed to have a *Power* to proceed without that *Writ*. I will put the Argument into a Syllogisme, and it will run thus.

Whatsoever a man *defers* to do, he must be supposed to have a *Power* to do.

But the *Elected Clergy* *deferr'd* proceeding to Business before the reception of the *Provincial Writ*.

Therefore the *Elected Clergy* must be supposed to have a *Power* to proceed to Business, before the reception of the *Provincial Writ*.

This is his Argument in Form; and in order to make the consequence absurd, the word *Power* must be taken Equivocally, so as to signifie one thing in the *Major Proposition*, and another in the *Conclusion*. In the former it must signifie *Natural Abilities*, in the latter *Legal Authority*; and then there will be Four Terms in the Syllogism.

But if he says, that he takes the word *Power* in the same signification in both Propositions, then it must signifie in both places, either *Natural Abilities* or *Legal Authority*; if the former, then I allow the Premises to be true, and the *Conclusion* to follow necessarily from them, viz. That the *Elected Clergy* must be supposed to have a *Power* (*i. e.* *Natural Abilities*) to proceed to Business before the reception of the *Provincial Writ*; for they wanted neither Feet to bring them together, nor Tongues to Debate and Declare their Minds when they were together; and therefore it was not for want of *Power* in this Sense that they *deferr'd* proceeding to Business.

But perhaps he will say, that by the word *Power*, he means in both Propositions *Legal Authority*; then also I will allow the Syllogism to be good as to the form of it, but I must deny the Major; and in opposition to it, do affirm that a Man
may

may be properly said to *defer* the doing of a thing, and yet not be supposed to have a *Power* (i. e. a *Legal Authority*) to do it. May not a Man *defer* Publishing a Libel, or Defaming his Brethren, or doing any other irregular Action, without being supposed to have a *Power*, i. e. a *Legal Authority* to do these things?

But to come nearer to our own Case; What is more usual than for People, that doubt whether a thing be lawful or no, to *defer* the doing it, till they can get their Doubts removed. And this I apprehend was the Case of many of the Members, who therefore were for *deferring* business till the reception of the *Provincial Writ*, because they doubted whether it was lawful to proceed without it or no.

Now I cannot imagine to what purpose all this Dust is raised about the construction of a Word; especially since the *Remarker* himself has assured him, that he knows of no Body now, besides the *Letter-Writer*, that is of Opinion that the *Clergy* might have proceeded upon business without the *Provincial Writ*. But that the *Letter-Writer* is of opinion, that the *Clergy* not only might, but actually did proceed without it, the *Remarker* has proved even to a demonstration, and the *Vindicator* says Nothing to it. Pag. 7.

But the *Vindicator* is much *Misinform'd* if most of Mr. Per- Pag. 6.
civale's Friends in England did not understand him in the same Sense with the *Letter-Writer*. If the *Vindicator's* Correspondents make as free with him as he does with them, he may probably be much *Misinform'd*: And a sweet Correspondence, no doubt, it is, if each side has equal reason to complain of *Misinformations*.

But how comes the *Vindicator* to say, That the *Remarker* agrees that the *Provincial Writs* were not executed, and let the wrong step be laid at whose door it will? Sure this man thinks that he may not only say what he pleases, but put what he pleases into the Mouths of others also; the *Remarker* is so far Pag. 9.
from agreeing that they were not executed, that he has taken some pains to prove, that they were to all intents and purposes executed, with as much Effect, as if every Member, Elected by the *Præmunientes*, had been again Elected by virtue of the *Provincial Writ* also; and is this agreeing that the *Writs* were not executed? In the very next line He calls the Defence which the *Remarker* made weak, and very weak indeed it would have been; Nay, it would have been no Defence

Pag. 8.

fence at all, if he had agreed that they were not executed. But as *weak* as his Defence is, the *Vindicator* has not been able to make any the least Reply to it. Indeed upon the *Letter-Writer's* saying, that both Houses were *Over-seen*, and had made *Wrong steps*; the *Remarker* says, *If there was a Wrong step, it ought to be laid somewhere else, than at their Door. It is well known, that the Two Writs ought regularly to Issue together; and had they done so, there would then have been no room for these Imputations, which the Letter-Writer throws so liberally upon the Two Houses.* 'Tis therefore plain, that the *Wrong-step* (which he only mentions with an *if*) was in those who did not cause the *Two Writs* to Issue together, as he presumes they regularly ought; and not that it consisted in the Non-execution of the *Provincial Writ*, after it had Issued.

The Mistake of the *Letter-Writer*, in imagining that the *Provincial Writ* was not executed, seems to be founded intirely upon this, that there was no Second Election upon that *Writ*; which yet (had it been necessary) the *Remarker* has shewn to have been done *virtually* and *tacitly*, as before it had been done *actually*, upon the *Premunientes*; and that there was not one Clergy-man in the whole Kingdom, who did not think himself fully and regularly represented in *Convocation*. And, when that part of his Letter came to be examined, it was made to appear, to the full satisfaction of every individual Person, that no new Election ought to have been made upon it. For what does the *Provincial Writ* direct? Nothing more than this, that the several *Archbishops* should issue their Mandates to the several *Bishops* of their respective Provinces, to bring with them to *Convocation* their several *Deans*, and *Archdeacons*, together with the *Proctors*, for their respective Chapters and Clergy. Now all this can't be denied to have been regularly done, and consequently the *Writ* must have been fully and intirely executed. Indeed, had there been no Persons in being, who were invested with a Power to Represent the Chapters, and Clergy of the several Diocesses, then it would have been necessary to have *elected* upon the *Writ*: Because otherwise the *Bishops* could not have brought with them the *Proctors* for their respective Chapters and Clergy; but the Case here was otherwise. And I desire to know of this Gentleman, (since he thinks that a new Election was necessary) what must have been done, in case different *Members* had been elected upon the *Provincial*, from what

what had been elected upon the *Præmunientes*? As it is more than probable, it would have happen'd, in some places at least. In such a Case, which of the elected *Members* must have served in *Convocation*? Those elected upon the *Præmunientes*? Or those elected upon the *Provincial*? Or both? Or neither? What a Confusion would this Gentleman's notion, if it had taken place, involved us in? And can a greater Argument be used against it, than to shew the Absurdities with which it abounds? And therefore, it was with good reason that the Committee, after very great deliberation, came to the following Resolutions, upon the 18th Paragraph of the *Letter*.

Resolved, *Nemine contradicente*, That the Archbishops issuing *Mandates* to the several Bishops of their respective *Provinces*, in pursuance of the *Provincial Writs*, is a due and sufficient execution of the said *Writs*, as far as the said Archbishops are obliged to execute the same.

Resolved, *Nemine contradicente*, That in pursuance of the said *Mandates*, the Bishops giving notice to, and requiring their several Deans, and Archdeacons, together with the Proctors for their respective Chapters and Clergy, that have been duly elected by Virtue of the *Præmunientes* Clauses, to appear at the place appointed by the said Archbishops, is a due and sufficient execution of the said *Writs*, as far as the said Bishops are obliged to execute the same.

Resolved, *Nemine contradicente*, That the *Provincial Writs* for this present *Convocation*, have been duly executed.

Resolved, *Nemine contradicente*, That this Paragraph doth strike directly at the very Being of this *Convocation*, by asserting that the *Writs* for Electing and Returning the *Members* thereof, were not duly executed; and consequently that this *Convocation* is not convened by a *Legal Authority*.

Resolved, *Nemine contradicente*, That the Assertion contain'd in this Paragraph, that the *Provincial Writs* were never duly executed, is a False and Injurious Reflection upon their Graces and Lordships the Lords Archbishops and Bishops of this Kingdom.

And these Resolutions, were not drawn up by the Archdeacon, or any of his *Adherents*; but by One of the *Letter-Writer's* own *Adherents*, Mr. Syngé; Who proved the Truth of every thing, contain'd and asserted in these Resolutions, with so much clearness, such evidence of Facts, such convincing Arguments, and
Appen. Pag. x.
all

all of them so well known to that numerous Assembly, who were then present, that the Gentlemen of the Opposite side had not one word to return him, but sat down baffled and confounded. All this the *Vindicator* knows to be true; and therefore I wonder, that He should notwithstanding insult, as if he had received no Rebuke upon this point. I think (says he) the House has no reason to thank him (the Remarker) for pushing so far (as he does in Page 7.) the Non Execution of the Provincial Writs, and it is not very Prudent to urge an Adversary to aggravate Mistakes. Had there been Mistakes therefore, it seems, our Adversary was ready to aggravate them. We are oblig'd to him for his good inclinations; and are very Happy that he has the Will only, and not the Power, to do our Constitution any mischief.

Par. 17. The Letter-Writer had said, that the Clergy elected by the *Præmunientes*, agreed to mix themselves in the meetings of the Dublin Clergy, to prevent any Umbrage or Offence, that might be taken at such a concourse of the Clergy as attended then in Dublin.

Pag. 7. This the Remarker says, is not true, and that they never intermix'd themselves with them. I admire therefore, how the *Vindicator* can say, that this (to intermix with the Dublin Clergy) was

Ibid. the Advice given, and the Resolution taken at their first Meeting in St. Patrick's Church, and that their Practice was accordingly. Not a word of this is denied, and yet he (the Letter-Writer) is a very Tyndal or Toland for affirming it. How! Is not one word of this deny'd? has not the Remarker, as just above cited, said, that it is not true, and that they never intermixt themselves with them? With what Face can this Man impose upon his Reader? And was it for affirming this, that he was said to be a very Tyndal or Toland? No, how false soever his affirmations were, it was not for that; but for insinuating that such a concourse of the Clergy would have given Umbrage or Offence. I can't see, says the Remarker, to what purpose it is, that he represents the Clergy in such a despicable condition, unless he would have it thought, that the Clergy is a dangerous Body of Men; or at least, which is much the same, that the Laity thinks them so: A Notion fitter for a Tyndal or a Toland, than for one who professes himself to be a Son of the Church.

Pag. 7. But because he has still the confidence to affirm, that the Practice of the Elected Members was in this point according to his Representation of it; I have made some Enquiries amongst the Dublin Clergy concerning those Meetings, which

he in his *Letter* represents to be held once a Week; and I am well informed, that they had not so much as one Meeting during the whole space, he would insinuate that the Elected Members intermixt with them. For from the 22d of *March*, 1701, in which Meeting Dr. *Ryves* presided, they had no Meeting till the 8th of *July*, 1704, in which Dr. *Stearn* presided. And yet the time, in which the Elected Members are supposed to have intermixt themselves with the *Dublin Clergy*, was from the 21st of *Septemb.* 1703, when they met by virtue of the *Premunientes*, to the 11th of *Jan.* 1704, when they sat by virtue of the *Provincial Writ* also.

There is a Register kept of all these Meetings, and by That it will easily appear, whether this be true or not. And therefore the Committee had good reason to Resolve, as they did, upon the 17th Paragraph of this *Letter*; *That the Clergy of this Kingdom meeting in Dublin upon the Premunientes Clause, did not agree to conceal or mix themselves with any Private Meetings of the Dublin Clergy, for fear of giving any Umbrage or Offence; as is suggested in this Paragraph.* Pag. 7.

But he would have the *Remarker* thought injurious to the *Dublin Clergy*, who, he says, do not imagine that they skulk or abscond in the Meetings at their *Vestries*. Nor does the *Remarker* think it; but if the *Country Clergy*, who were Summoned to Town by the *Queen's Writ*, had intermixt with them, in hopes to pass unobserved in the Crowd, and to be taken for what they were not; I suppose, they would very truly have been said to skulk and abscond amongst them.

The *Letter-Writer* had given a very scurvy Account of our Proceedings; as to the Election of the Vice-Prolocutor; that the *Prolocutor* took his Coach, and left the Vice-Prolocutor in the *Chair*, before he had been regularly Elected: and that the *Bishops* were so incensed upon this occasion, as to send the Lower House word, that they would hold no Correspondence with them, and a great deal to this purpose; and all this he was pleased to inform the World of, without any the least Provocation from the *Paper* that he pretends to Answer; for that *Paper* has not one single word relating to the Vice-Prolocutor in it. This, when the *Remarker* comes to examine, he shews to be all False and intirely of the *Letter-Writer's* own Invention. And now what says the *Indicator* to it? Why truly, if there be a Mistake in this circumstance (so becaus the Irregularity of Pag. 7. the

the Prolocutor's leaving the House) it is no great One, nor will the Letter-Writer be afraid or ashamed to own it: but he verily believes it is so as he Represents it. But, if this circumstance be no great One, how came he to mention it at all? Was there any thing in the Paper before him, which led him to it? No, but it seem'd to be a wrong Step, which, good Man! he could not conceal, tho' it made nothing to his Argument, whether it were true or false. Had it been true, we should have heard enough of It; this *Mole-hill* had then been magnified into a *Mountain*: and he would perhaps have infer'd from it a Nullity in our Proceedings, as he has already done with less reason upon another occasion. But now since he is detected, he wipes his Mouth, and says, if there be a *Mistake*, 'tis no great one.

Pag. 7. But for this, as well as for the Truth of the angry Message, which he reported to have been sent from the *Upper House* to the *Lower*: and which the *Remarker* charges upon him, as the Product of his own Fruitful Invention; he says, he is willing to be concluded, by the Memory of the Persons present at the whole Transaction. The *Remarker* is willing to be concluded by the same; and let us hear, how they have determin'd the matter in Dispute, as They have done in the Committee appointed to examine the Letter: And on this part of it, they came to the following Resolution.

Par. 20. Resolved, That this Paragraph concerning the Election of the Prolocutor, and the Vice-Prolocutor, contains several Particulars, which are utterly false, viz.

In asserting, first, that the Prolocutor did go strait to his Coach, after he had acquainted their Lordships, with his Indisposition, and Nomination of a Substitute; whereas he returned to the House, and stay'd there 'till their Lordships sent for him, and told him, that they excus'd him from his Attendance; and gave the Lower-House leave to choose a Vice-Prolocutor. And upon his Return to the House with that Message, the Reverend Dr. Stearne, Dean of St. Patrick's was unanimously elected.

In asserting, secondly, that their Lordships sent for this House, and told them, that they acted too forwardly, in pretending to choose a Vice-Prolocutor, without first asking leave of them to proceed to that Election; Whereas their Lordships did no such thing.

In asserting, thirdly, that their Lordships told this House, that they would not hold any Correspondence with them, till they pray'd the

the leave of the Upper-House to do it; Whereas this House receiv-
ed no such Message from them.

But besides, that our Proceedings might not in any one
point seem regular, the *Letter-Writer* asserted (and it is re-
peated by the *Vindicator*) that the Upper-House Book of the *Pag. 8.*
Convocation of 1661, plainly shews, that the method used by the
present Lower-House in choosing a Prolocutor was quite differ-
ent, in several circumstances, from that which they made use of at
that time. Upon this several Members were appointed to in-
spect that Book, who accordingly did so; and found that the
Method then made use of, was exactly the same as was used
in this present Convocation. And therefore the Committee
came to a Resolution, upon that part of the *Letter*; that the
Journals of the Upper-House in 1661, do plainly shew, that the
Method of choosing a Prolocutor in this Convocation is the same
as it was in 1661.

And, as no Fact can escape him without being censured for
some irregularity or other: So there is no Right, that the
Letter-Writer does not take occasion to call in question. Even *Pag. 8.*
that of appointing our own Committees (and this too he re-
peats in his *Vindication*) he will not allow to be built upon
any just, and solid Foundation; which occasion'd the Com-
mittee (after they had examined the Paragraph relating to
that point) to Resolve, that the House has an undoubted Right
of appointing it's own Committees, notwithstanding the *Insinuations*
of that Paragraph to the contrary.

The *Letter-Writer* had said, that no Man was ever pronounced *Par. 22.*
Contumacious in the Lower-House. And this he affirm'd in op-
position to the Paper of the *Two Members* which had called some
Members *Contumaciously Absent*. Would any one imagine, that
the *Letter-Writer* should accuse the *Two Members* upon this Arti-
cle; when He was the very Man that pressed in the *Lower House*,
to have the *Absent Members* pronounced *Contumacious*? Nay, who
asserted farther, that the House had such a Power over their
own Members, as to Expel them? The Reply that the *Re-*
marker gave to his Accusation was; that the *Lower-House* pro-
nounced them *Contumacious* as much as the Paper does, and
he quoted an undeniable Instance of it, out of the Papers of
the *Upper House*. And, without entering into any argument
as to the Right, proves that they did it as far as they had

And if they think fit to
sit as the *Lower House of Ireland*, as the *Letter-Writer*
Presents and Authorities to themselves; it is their
business who apply them, to look to the Weight and Conclu-
sion of them. The *Two Members* are not at all concern'd
in it, they are answerable only for the Truth of the Facts,
which they have related: and the Truth of the Facts would
not at all have been affected by it, even if there had been no
manner of Precedent or Authority to found them upon.

And the *Remarker* would not have given himself the trou-
ble of saying any thing, concerning the Right and Authority,
upon which they were founded, but that he saw the *Letter-Writer*
nibbling at them; and where he could not deny them,
there endeavouring to invalidate their Authority.

The *Paper* of the *Two Members* had said, that *this Power of*
the Lower House to adjourn it self was own'd, and allow'd by the
Archbishops and Bishops, then at Dublin, in their Answer to
some Queries sent to them by the Right Honourable the Earl of
Nottingham, then Principal Secretary of State in England, be-
fore the calling of this Convocation. This the *Letter-Writer*
could not deny; but then he comes in with all the extenua-
ting circumstances that his poor skill could furnish him with;
as, that it was only the opinion of a few Bishops, not too well ac-
quainted at that time with Convocation Rights. When the
Committee saw this, they thought fit to Vindicate the in-
jured Reputation of their Bishops, by voting this Paragraph,
to be a gross Reflection on the Judgment of those excellent Prelates,
who answered the *Lord Nottingham's Letter*.

Par. 24.

And the *Remarker*, tho' he was only concern'd to justify
the Truth of the Fact, yet thought it convenient to give the
Reader some light into the *Precedents and Authorities*, which
might have been urged for this Right, if it had been dispu-
ted; least, by the Insinuations of the *Letter-Writer*, he might
imagine that we had none.

The only Argument that the *Letter-Writer* brought against
our Meeting in intermediate Sessions, was this; that as the
Upper House Books take no notice of them, so the Lords have
never yet by any Publick Act of their House, given or shown their
Approbation of them. To which the *Remarker* replied, What
Publick Act or Approbation would this *Man expect to be given*
for

Par. 24.

for a known Right never disputed, but always enjoyed by the Lower House, and known to be so enjoyed by every Member of the Upper House? Did their Lordships ever stand in the way in holding their Sessions? Or did they even refuse any Act or Paper passed the House in such a Session?

This certainly was Answer enough to so poor a Cavil; but, for his and others farther Satisfaction, to this Argument from a known undisturbed Possession of a Right never disputed, he thought fit to add some others of no less Weight. As,

First, the acknowledgment of my Lord Primate, the President of the Convocation, made to the House February 4th, 1704. by the Prolocutor, Dr. Tisdale his Grace's Chaplain, and others.

Secondly, the Testimony of the Two only surviving Members (that we know) of the last Convocation, his Grace the Lord Archbishop of Tuam, and Bishop Sheridan.

Thirdly, the Journals of the Upper-House of 1661, the only Remains that we have of that Convocation.

Now, let us see what the *Vindicator* has to say to these Remarks.

Pag. 10. In answer to the first, He says, it is own'd that such a Report was made to the House, but by what unhappy Mistake of my Lord Primates words, this Message was deliver'd to the House, I know not. That there was a Mistake of my Lord Primate's

Ibid. words, he endeavours to prove by saying, that every body may remember, that in a day or two after, Mr. Tisdale came in great concern to the House, of which He was, and is a Member, and told them, that He had mistaken my Lord Primate's Meaning, that his Grace did not intend, any such Message to be deliver'd to the House, and that he must necessarily fall under his Grace's highest displeasure, if the House did not agree to raze it out of their Minutes.

This Message was occasioned by some uneasiness that appear'd amongst the Members of the Lower House, upon the alteration that had happen'd in the Intimation of the Adjournment; for some apprehended that by the Term [this Convocation] the Lower House was intended to be included. And to remove any jealousy of this Nature it was, that his Grace was pleased to send this Message; in which he assured the House by the Prolocutor, that neither He, nor any of his Bretheren, had the least thought

thoughts of concluding the Lower-House by their Adjournments. And *Dr. Tisdale* his Grace's Chaplain being called upon by the *Prolocutor* spoke to the same effect, and they appeal'd to *Dr. Wy,* *Dr. B.* and *Dr. Reader,* who were all present when his Grace deliver'd the Message, and who attested the Truth of it. Now, had there been any Mistake in the delivery of this Message, either as to the Matter or Manner of it, 'tis strange that every One of these Gentlemen should concur in it. It was deliver'd to the House that very morning that the *Prolocutor* had received it from his Grace, and not many hours after; so that it is scarce possible, that they should all so soon forget either the Substance or the Circumstances of it.

The Message had the intended Effect: And the House ordered the *Prolocutor* to return their humble Thanks to his Grace for his great Condescension in this Matter, and to assure him, that all their Fears and Jealousies were allay'd by it. This his Grace received very favourably, and at the same time told the *Prolocutor*, that *the Lower-House's having Intermediate Sessions was neither disputed nor taken ill, but that they might freely pursue their Right therein; only that it was fit or necessary that they should, after such Intermediate Sessions, still Mind to keep to the Day, that the Upper House had adjourned to.* And his Grace gave him Leave and Authority to intimate this to the House. All this I have Transcribed out of the *Cross'd Minutes*, which are still very Legible. Now is it probable, if the *Prolocutor* had mistaken my Lord Primate's Meaning, or had delivered a Message that had not been intended to be deliver'd to the House, that his Grace would have return'd such an Answer? Indeed that *Dr. Tisdale* came afterwards and declared, that it was not my Lord Primate's Meaning, that his Message should be enter'd upon the Journals, is True. And therefore out of Respect and Deference to his Grace, they agreed to erase it.

But now, what part of the Remarks does this Account of the *Vindicator* Contradict? It is own'd, he says, that such a Report was made to the House. Very well; and if, as he says, it be not to be found upon the Journals; neither has the *Remarker* represented it as on the Journals. It's being or not being upon the Journals, does not affect either the Truth or the Weight of it. The Journals are only Evidences of Fact, but if the Fact be own'd, as in this Case it is, there is no need to appeal to the Journals for it. But what Idea, (says he) does
 this

this give us of an *Authoritative Act* of the President of the whole Convocation? Did the *Remarker* mention this as an *Authoritative Act*? No certainly; and therefore the Reader will look upon this *Idea* to be a *Chimera* of his own Forming, and a fresh Instance of the *Vindicator's* Sincerity. The *Remarker* represents it to be done by the President, out of *Convocation*, in his *private Capacity*, and consequently not as any *Authoritative Act*; being only designed to satisfy the *Lower-House*, that no Invasion was intended to be made upon their Right to *Intermediate Sessions*.

Now in these few Lines of the *Vindicator's* there are several things worthy of *Observation*. As, 1. He allows the whole of what the *Remarker* had related; that such a Message was delivered to the House: And yet some things he imputes to him, which he had never related; namely, that this was an *Authoritative Act* of the President. 2. As he expresses it, the Reader would imagine, that Dr. *Tisdale* alone deliver'd the Message to the House; for He is said to have come and told them, that He had Mistaken my Lord Primate's Meaning: Whereas it is well known, that it was the *Prolocutor* as well as the Doctor that delivered the Message, and consequently, if there had been any Mistake, it was imputable to Him, and to the other Doctors that attested it, as well as to Dr. *Tisdale*. 3. Dr. *Tisdale* is represented to have come to the House in great Concern, and saying, that he must necessarily fall under his Grace's highest displeasure, if the House did not agree to raze it out of their Minutes: Now, why is Dr. *Tisdale* represented in such a pitious Condition, under such fears and apprehensions, as if his Life and Fortune were at stake? Whereas, had there been a Mistake, and He the sole Author of it; could it be imagined that my Lord Primate, so remarkable for his Tenderness and Indulgence to his Clergy, should prove so Rigorous and Severe to a deserving Chaplain, as to bring him under his highest Displeasure for so innocent a Mistake? But the *Vindicator* spares no One that comes in his way: To be a Member of *Convocation* is Crime enough, to bring any man under his lash.

The Second Argument that the *Remarker* brought to prove this point was, the Testimony of his Grace the Archbishop of *Tuam*, and Bishop *Sheridan*, the Two only surviving Members of

of the last Convocation. And what says the *Vindicator* to this? He says, that indeed those Two Prelates have been Appeal'd to, *Pag. 112.* but a bare Appeal is no full Proof that either of them have given such a Testimony. Will he therefore put the issue upon their Testimony? The *Vindicator* heard several Members declare in the House, that these Two Prelates had not only been Appeal'd to, but had actually given their Testimony as to this point: And He might have learnt as much from his Friend Dr. Lambert; for He says in the Remarkable Introduction which he drew up to the Claim of Rights, that the House had strictly enquired into the Usages of former Convocations, from such Persons as were best able to inform them. And he well knows, that these Persons were no other than the Two Prelates here mention'd. It is therefore a poor Cavil, and has not the least foundation in truth, to pretend that they have been appeal'd to only, but had not given their Testimony upon the Appeal. And so sensible he seems to be of the weakness of it, that He attempts, as much as in him lies, to invalidate their Testimony.

His Grace of Tuam, he tells us, being supposed to be now about the Age of 70, must have been a very young Convocation-man at that time; and 'tis not to be imagin'd that his Grace will tax his Memory, &c. And this after he knew that his Grace had tax'd his Memory, and was well able so to do. Had this been said either by a Person of a less blemish'd Reputation than the Letter-Writer: or of a Person of less known and unquestioned Abilities than his Grace, it might have left an Impression upon the Reader, as if his Grace had been then too young and giddy to regard what was done in Convocation, or too old now to recollect it. The House could not bear such a gross Insinuation, against so Learned and Eminent a Prelate; and therefore they thought fit, upon the Examination of the 6th Paragraph of the Letter, to come to the following Resolution; Which, being such a full and solemn Declaration of the Lower Clergy of Ireland, express'd by their Representatives in Convocation, will be a perpetual Monument of the grateful Sense, which they have, of this great Prelate's Worth and Integrity.

Resolved, That that part of this Paragraph, relating to his Grace the Archbishop of Tuam, is an unworthy Reflection on his Grace, designed to lessen his Testimony, in reference to the Rights of the Lower House of Convocation, by mentioning his Youth, when a Member of the same.

of the Lower House of Convocation, in 1662; and then he was Archdeacon of Armagh, and Chaplain to the Honorable House of Commons: And by Suggesting the weakness of his Grace's Memory; when it is well known, that his Grace's Memory and great Understanding are as good and perfect as ever: And his Honour and Veracity so unquestionable, that no Person whatsoever is more capable of giving Testimony, or more deserving Credit in what he relates.

His Cavil against Bishop Sheridan's Testimony is; 1. That
 Pag. 12. he thinks him a much worse Witness in this Matter, since his Removal out of Ireland, than before. But for his thinking thus, he assigns no manner of Reason. 2. He doubts, and would have proof of his Convocation Capacity. He knows that several Members assured him in the House, that they had it from himself in Person, that he had been a Member of that Convocation; and sure his Word may be taken, as to that Point. 3. The Bishop esteems all Parties, concerned in this Controversy, to be both Rebels and Schismatics. If so, he is upon the Foot of Impartiality, since he has the same Opinion of all Parties. Ibid. Ay, but 4. He esteems some more so than others. Can there be any Sense or Meaning in this? If he esteems us all Rebels and Schismatics for complying with the Government, how can he esteem some more so than others, since we all equally comply? I suppose he would have it thought, that those who oppose him, are not so well affected to the Government as He; this he Insinuates in many places of his Vindication; and he shall hear more of it anon.

But now, must Bishop Sheridan's Testimony have no weight? Must he be lookt upon as a Man divested of all common Honesty, and not permitted to be Witness in any Cause, because he refused the Oaths to the Government? Time was, when this Gentleman was not so squeamish about Witnesses. Had this Prelate ever been in the least suspected, either of bearing False-Witness himself, or Suborning others to do so, a fair Objection would then have lain against him; but nothing of this is pretended. I never yet heard his Morals or Veracity called in question; and if he was so unhappily prejudiced, as to choose to part with his Bishoprick, rather than to comply with the Government: We allow, as readily as the Vindicator, that in our Opinion, his Conscience was in this Point Mistaken and Erroneous. But, suppose this Prelate had been

a down-right Papist, and so had esteem'd us all to be, not only *Rebels and Schismatics*, but *Heresicks* also. I presume it will not be denied, but that his Testimony would be admitted in any Court of Judicature in the Kingdom. And this no doubt the *Letter-Writer* knew very well, when he wholly concealed this Bishops Testimony, at the same time that he endeavored to invalidate his Grace of Tuam's; tho' he knew that they were both appeal'd to in the same *Paper*. This piece of Disingenuity the House took notice of, when they had the 6th Paragraph of his *Letter* under their Consideration, upon the former part of which, they came to the following Resolution.

Resolved, That the former part of this Paragraph, is *Disingenuous and Unfair*, in not mentioning the Testimony of Dr. Sheridan, deprived Bishop of Kilmore, in reference to the Lower Houses holding Intermediate Sessions in the Convocation in 1661. he being now alive, and at London.

The third Argument, viz. That drawn from the Journals of the Upper-House of 1661, the *Vindicator* freely confesses to have had more force with him than all the other Authorities *Pag. 13.* which have been produced for Intermediate Sessions. But he wonders there are not more instances of the same Nature to be found in the Books of the Upper-House: Whereas the *Remarker* wonders there is so much as this One, considering it is the Book of the Upper-House, and not of the Lower, from whence it is taken. And tho' it has very great Force with him, yet he can't go so far with the *Letter-Writer*, as to say it has more than all the other Authorities which have been produced. For he thinks that the Testimony of the Arch-bishop of Tuam, and Bishop Sheridan is so unexceptionable, that it is of equal Force with it. Nay, it ought to be of more with one, that can suppose that the Journal might be corrupted, either thro' the Mistake or Negligence of the Clerk, as the *Vindicator* seems to think; for he says, that this is not concealed in Partiality Detected, where- *Ibid.* in it is in some Measure accounted for. And all the account that that Author gives of it, is nothing more than his own groundless conjecture, as that it might be owing to the Mistake of the Clerk. Could I therefore think, that such a Mistake were probable, as the *Vindicator* seems to do; I am sure the joint Testimony of Two living Witnesses of undeniable Credit, would

would have greater Force with me, than those Journals so liable (according to him) to be mistaken.

Pag. 13. Having thus said the utmost, that possibly he can, against this Claim, he submits it to the Consciences of the Lower-Clergy, who then attended the House, to say impartially, which prevail'd most upon them, the Authority and Presidents produced by the Remarker: or the warm contentings of the Majority of the Lower-House in England for these Intermediate Sessions. Perhaps this latter Motive will appear to be that which prevail'd upon the Letter-Writer, when he thinks fit to submit it to his Conscience: For it must not be forgot that no Man was a more Zealous Assertor of this Claim than He. But as for the rest of the Lower-Clergy, what their Consciences were, as to this point, he may learn in their Resolutions against the 24th Paragraph of his Letter, which are as follow.

Resolved, That it is the undoubted and allowed Right of the Lower-House of Convocation to hold Intermediate Sessions, and Adjourn it self.

Resolved, That the Right of the Lower-House of Convocation to Adjourn it self, and hold Intermediate Sessions, is not derived from the warm Contentings of the Lower-House of Convocation in England; as is most falsely asserted in this Paragraph.

Resolved, That the Right of the Lower-House, to Adjourn it self, and hold Intermediate Sessions, is founded on the usages of former Convocations in this Kingdom; as appears by the Journals of the Upper-House, and by the undoubted Testimony of his Grace the Lord Archbishop of Tuam, and of Dr. Sheridan de-prived Bishop of Kilmore, Members of the Lower-House of Convocation in 1661.

The Vindicator comes now to justify the Letter-Writer, as to what he had said concerning the Forms of Adjournment. According to the Letter-Writer the Form of Adjournment for the first four or five Days was, that his Grace, &c. Adjourned
 Par. 25. the Whole Convocation which I am not pleasing the Lower-Clergy, their Lordships thought fit to alter it to (This Convocation) And then he says; I am confident, there has been no variation from their Form since the first Week of their Sitting. In
 Pag. 19. opposition to which the Remarker shew'd out of the Journals, that one Form was made use of January 11th, the first Day of their Sitting; another on January 25th; and another different

rent from them both January 28th. And how does the *Vindicator* bring his Friend off? The *Letter-Writer*, says he, has said that from the first Week or thereabouts of the Convocation's sitting, the Form has continued almost the same. How come the Words *thereabouts* and *almost* to be Inserted? The *Letter-Writer* had said in his usual Style, that he was *Confident*; without any of these limitations, which his *Vindicator* obtrudes upon the Reader. And is not this a poor Evasion? Had it not been more ingenuous to have said, that the *Letter-Writer* was mistaken in this Circumstance, that it was no great One, Pag. 7. nor will the Writer of the Letter be afraid or ashamed to own it?

In Answer to what the *Remarker* had asserted, in direct Contradiction to the *Letter-Writer*, that no Intimation was ever used with this Form (Whole Convocation) in it; the *Vindicator* amuses the Reader by telling him, that there are Eighty Original Intimations of Adjournment, Sixty One of which are in the Form mentioned in the Letter. Here he thinks he has left himself room for an Evasion, for two or three different Forms are mentioned in the Letter. But is any one of those Intimations in the Form we are now Disputing about? Have any one of them the words (*Whole Convocation*) in it? No, this is not pretended; and therefore to say that they are in any other Form, is Impertinent and Foreign from the purpose. The Committee he knows Examined into this point, and found it to be exactly as the *Remarker* had asserted, and came to a Resolution accordingly; That no form of Adjournment with the words (*Whole Convocation*) in it, was ever sent down by their Lordships to this House. Pag. 13.

And yet the *Vindicator* concludes this Head after his mannerly way; and says, so little reason had the *Remarker* to fall foul on the *Letter-Writer*, for saying, that the Form was constant; and it is the less excusable in him, to commit the Mistake, he having had the advantage of recourse to the Books, which he knew the Writer of the Letter neither had nor could have. True it is, that the *Remarker* had recourse to the Books, which is the reason he has committed no Mistakes; had he spoke without Book, he might very probably have been Guilty of as many Mistakes as the *Letter-Writer*; for these Points are of such a trifling Nature, that he never thought it worth while, to burthen his Memory with them. And if the *Letter-Writer* could not have recourse to the Books (being I suppose in England, Pag. 14.

land, for otherwise they were open to him) yet he might have abstained from being Positive and Confident of these things either till he himself or some Friend for him had consulted them.

To what the *Remarker* had related about Dr. *Lambert's* saying, that *He would Protest in the Upper House*, his *Indicator* Pag. 20. replies thus; the Doctor was far from acquiescing in the Resolutions of so thin a House as that was, and where he saw matters managed in methods, which a numerous House would never have agreed to; but he thought it time enough to offer his Protest at the first Synodical Session. And the reason, why he did not offer it at the Lord's House, was, as he tells us, because he did not believe, that anything in that Paper, or relating to it, was of Moment enough, to be the possible Occasion of a contest between the Two Houses.

The Doctor judged very rightly in believing so: But it seems, that if the Paper had been of Moment enough to be the possible Occasion of a Contest between the Two Houses, he would then have offered his Protest, in hopes of creating such a Contest. No thanks to him for his good Will; Mischief and Division is what he drives at: But at that time he thought there was not a possible Occasion. How then, I pray, does he now come to think that this same Paper, is of Moment enough to be, not only the possible, but the actual Occasion of a Contest: Not between the Two Houses only, but between the Convocations of the Two Kingdoms? For this is what he would fain persuade us, that the Two Convocations are, upon this Account, actually engaged in a furious War, tho' neither of them know any thing of it. But was he really at that time so far from acquiescing? And did he then take notice that they were the Resolutions of a thin House? I am sure, that at that time he seem'd to acquiesce as much as any Member: Nor did he then make the least Objection against the thinness of the House; which, I believe he can't but own, was the fullest of any that appear'd that whole Session. And as for his seeing Matters managed in Methods: Is it a fault for Matters to be managed in Methods? Or, in other Words, for Matters to be managed Methodically? Methods and management run so much in his Head, that he thinks nothing can be done without them. But did He complain that the House had used any Sinister Methods? Had any such been, no doubt he would have told us of them. One indeed he mentioned in his Letter, but the Remarker shewed him that That was no Sinister Method, and that in the Nature of the thing

thing it could not be practised in the House, if it had been One.

The *Vindicator* goes on and says, that the Remarker endeavours to raise a storm against the Letter-Writer for asserting a Fact, which he does not in the least pretend to Contradict. For he owns, how few and short the Lords Answers were, to so many and long Papers sent up by the Lower-House. Where is it that he owns this? The Letter-Writer had represented the Bishops as indisposed all along for the dispatch of Business, and that the Clergy grew tired of staying in Town, as seeing no hopes of Business to be done, and that their Lordships so ordered their Sessions, as that Business was interrupted for want of Synodical Meetings. To which the Remarker says, I can answer for the Lower-House, that they had too many instances of their Lordships tenderness and goodness towards them, to harbour any Jealousy upon this Account; if their Papers were not answered as speedily as some expected, the House thought it reasonable to impute it to the multiplicity of Business, that lay upon their Lordships in Parliament, and to many other reasons without shewing the least dissatisfaction or resentment. And is this owning the Charge which the Letter-Writer brings against the Bishops, as if they were indisposed for the Dispatch of Business: And against the Lower-Clergy, as if they were Angry and Resenting under it?

The Letter-Writer had reported a very rude Message sent from the Lower-House about the Virger, and a very angry Message returned from their Lordships to us. This the Remarker shews to be every word of the Letter-Writer's own Inventing, for that no Message had ever passed between the Two Houses upon that Occasion. To this the *Vindicator* says, that This was only mentioned to show that their Lordships did not always agree to such Rights as were claimed by the Lower-House, wherein this was one Signal instance. A Signal instance indeed of a thing that never happened! But he joins with the Remarker in appealing to the Adjournment of all then present; the Remarker joins with him in the Appeal; and what the Opinion of the Members is concerning this Affair, the Reader may find by their Resolutions against this part of his Letter, which are as follow.

Resolved, That after some Debate in this House, whether they should receive a Message from the Lords of the Upper House by the Virger, this House did admit him with a salvo jure to their Privileges, as appears by the Journals of this House.

Resolved,

Resolved, That the Lower House of Convocation, did not send any such Message to the Upper House by their Messengers, nor received such an angry Message from their Lordships, as is asserted in this Paragraph.

One would think after this, that the *Vindicator* should be more Modest, than to persist in such a *Notorious Falsehood*; which has no other Foundation, than that there was a long Debate in the Lower House upon this occasion; and this is frankly own'd by the *Remarker*; but that any Message passed between the Two Houses about it, much less such angry Messages as the *Letter-Writer* reports; is so far from being true, that there are not the least Footsteps of it upon the Minutes, or Journals of either House. The *Letter-Writer* thinks that he has as much reason to know and remember this matter, as any Body, having been sent to the Lords House on that occasion, and (as he affirms) was at least as Instrumental in composing that Difference, as the *Remarker* or any of his Friends. This is his usual Flourish; Do any ill-minded People raise Differences between the Two Houses? the *Letter-Writer* composes them. Does the House want any Papers to be drawn up? the Pen of the *Letter-Writer* is imploy'd about it. He stands in the Gap, and hinders others from betraying the Convocation to the Parliament; He protects an Archbishop; fills the Chairs of Committees; and has the good Fortune to be thought as useful a Member as the *Remarker*. These and many other fine things we must believe, if we give credit to the *Vindicator*, for we have his word for them; but how far his word will go, since the late *Censures* passed upon his *Letter*, 'tis easy to judge. Indeed this last Difference He was as Instrumental in Composing, as any one; if it be proper to say so, where there was no Difference at all. And yet no thanks to the *Letter-Writer* that there was none; for he did what he could to inflame in this Affair, as well as in all others, where there was any the least possible handle to dispute with the Upper House; and his *Peace Intentions* not succeeding, he endeavours notwithstanding to make the World think that all those Differences did really happen, which he in vain attempted to draw the House into.

But if he was sent to the Lords House upon this Occasion, I hope, in his next he will tell us the Success of his Negotiation there. I never yet heard that we sent to their Lordships by

any other Person than the *Prolocutor*; and therefore if he had been sent, I fear he would not have been received; and much less, if he had gone to their Lordships of his own Head.

The *Two Members* had said, that the *Sessions of the Upper House*, tho' less frequent than those of the Lower, yet were so order'd by their Lordships, that *Business* was never Interrupted for want of *Synodical Meetings*; This, the *Letter-Writer* says, seems *Par. 28.* calculated on purpose to serve the turn of some Men; who are very industrious to represent their Superiours in the worst Colours they can. And the *Vindicator* says, that the *Remarker* could not but know, *Pag. 22.* that the Paper in that Article glanced at the Bishops of England; and that a Man, of the *Remarker's* Penetration, could not but see, that the Words could have no Relation to the Bishops of Ireland.

So far from that, that the *Remarker* cannot see how the Words can have relation to any, but the Bishops of Ireland: For how the Bishops of England should be Reflected on, in a plain Matter of Fact, relating wholly to the Convocation of Ireland, requires more than ordinary Penetration. Can't the Bishops of Ireland be mention'd with Gratitude and Respect for their Goodness to their Clergy here, but it must Reflect upon the Bishops of England? Will the *Vindicator* lay down such a hard Rule as this? Or, will the Bishops of England thank him for it?

Well, but the *Remarker* had said, that He may find, upon the *Pag. 24.* Journals of both Houses, *Business* of all sorts (proper to come before a Convocation, and necessary for the present Exigencies of the Church) prepared, and made ready for a future Convocation; In this, the *Vindicator* says, that the *Remarker* is inconsistent with him- *Pag. 16.* self, for that he owns that very little *Business* was done by the whole Synod. Where is it, that the *Remarker* owns this? He says indeed, that there were more *Synodical Meetings* than were *Pag. 23.* necessary for the dispatch of *Business*. And that *Synodical Meetings* were rather broke up sooner than they would have been, for want of *Business*; than that *Business* was interrupted for want of *Synodical Meetings*. And what then? Does it follow from hence, that no *Business*, or very little *Business* was done? Is it not very consistent that an Assembly may do a great deal of *Business*, and yet break up sometimes, sooner than otherwise they would have done, for want of *Business*? The Parliament during their Session may dispatch Abundance of *Business*, altho' it should happen that sometimes they Adjourn a day or two for want

want of *Business*, and at last end their Session intirely for the same Reason. When the *Vindicator* considers this, he will not see so much cause to insult, and say, *If this be not an Inconsistency, the Remarker may reconcile Contradictions.* Glad he would be, no doubt, to find an Inconsistency in him, who has exposed so many of the *Letter-Writer's*.

But he here flies from the thing in Dispute, which was, whether their Lordships did not so order their Sessions, as that *Business* was never Interrupted for want of *Synodical Meetings*. The *Two Members* had affirm'd this in their Paper, and the *Letter-Writer* very roundly contradicted it; and said, it was *so palpable a Mistake, that it is hard to think how it could be committed.* The *Members* of the *House* are certainly the proper Judges in this Affair, to them it was submitted, and they, upon the 28th Paragraph of the *Letter*, came to the following Resolution.

Resolved, *That the Assertion in this Paragraph, that the Lords of the Upper House so ordered their Sessions, that Business was Interrupted for want of Synodical Meetings, is a False and Injurious Reflection on their Lordships of the Upper House.*

The *Letter-Writer*, endeavouring to Represent the *Convocation* as Insignificant and Trifling as he could, told the World that there was not one *Synodical Act*, except a Declaration to Vindicate the Clergy from being disaffected to the Government, and the Succession. This, he says, was indeed a very seasonable, necessary Act: In opposition to which, As great a Trifle

as it was, the Remarker shew'd that there were several other Acts, as *Synodical* as that which he mentioned; As particularly the several *Addresses*, which the *Two Houses* *Synodically* joined in to the Queen, and to the Lord Lieutenant. To this the

Vindicator replies, that the *Letter-Writer* intended only such as peculiarly relate to the *Business* and Design of calling a Synod. Very well; let us see whether these *Addresses* are not such, as well as the *Declaration*; and we will try them by the Rules that he has laid down. *Synodical Acts*, says He, are such as declare the Sense of the Clergy in any point of Dispute or Controversy; such as relate to the Conduct and Behaviour of the Clergy, or those under their Charge; such as Vindicate them from Imputations of false Opinions in Religion and Government, &c.

Now,

Now, do not the *Addressees* declare the *Sense of the Clergy* in point of *Dispute or Controversy*, as well as the *Declaration*? Do not *They* as much relate to the *Conduct and Behaviour of the Clergy*? Do not *They* *Vindicate* them as much from *Imputations of false Opinions in Religion and Government*? For the *Addressees* do not only (as the *Vindicator* imagines) return Thanks to the *Ibid.* *Queen, and Her Lord Lieutenant, for Favours received under their respective Governments* (being often made before the Lord Lieutenant has any Opportunity of shewing his *Favours*;) but they are also *Declarative of the Opinion of the Body*, both in respect of *Religion and Government*. And therefore the *Letter-Writer* is still under the *Dilemma*, and must either own, that the *Declaration* is no *Synodical Act*: Or else, that there are more *Synodical Acts* than *One*. And that there were more *Synodical Acts* than *One*, appears from the *Resolution* which the *Committee* passed upon the 30th Paragraph of the *Letter*, which is as follows.

Resolved, *That there were several other Synodical Acts done by this Convocation, (as appears by the Journals of both Houses) besides the Declaration mentioned in this Paragraph.*

But how comes this Gentleman to take upon him so Magisterially to lay down Notes and Characteristicks of what shall, or what shall not be deem'd *Synodical Acts*? The only Notion that we hitherto have had of *Synodical Acts*, is, that they are the joint Acts of both Houses: Or in other Words, the Acts of the whole Synod; without having any regard to the subject Matter of those Acts. But under what Notion it is, that he brings in the *Prayers* to be a *Synodical Act*, I can't imagine; for, tho' each House made use of the same Form, yet I don't remember that they ever join'd together, but had their *Prayers* always seperately and distinctly in their respective Houses.

But now to come to the *Declaration* it self; the *Remarker* Pag. 24. said, that the Two Members had as great a hand in it as their Neighbours; the *Vindicator* replies to this, Not so great a hand as Pag. 17. some of their Neighbours, for tho' They were appointed Two of the Three to Print and Publish it, yet it was Drawn up by a Third hand, who had not the least Assistance from either of those Gentlemen, in the Drawing or Passing it thro' the House; but on the contrary, as much Opposition as they could make to it. This is one of the *Vindicator's* bold and hardy slanders.

As well as I can remember, at this distance, this *Declaration* was sent from the *Bishops*; and when it first came into the *House*, it was not thought so full and compleat, as it was afterwards; and the whole Debate in the *Lower-House*, was about making it Fuller, and more Declarative of our Principles, and not that any one single *Member* gave Opposition to it.

Pag. 17. But, if this *Declaration* was not both *Seasonable* and *Necessary*, how came both Houses to think it so? says the *Vindicator*. Now, that it was as *Seasonable*, and as *Necessary*, as those other *Acts*, that passed either or both Houses, I freely grant. But to say it was *Emphatically* so, and more than any other *Act*, does, I think, insinuate that the Clergy were vehemently suspected of being disaffected, and stood in need of such a *Declaration* to vindicate them. Had the *Convocation* done any thing, either by word or deed, that might give any reasonable Cause of Suspicion against them, then indeed it might have been both *Seasonable* and *Necessary*: But when nothing of this is pretended; but it was so far from it, that not *One Member* was ever charged with any thing, that could bring his Loyalty or Principles in Question, it was perhaps Expedient in the *Convocation* to make such a *Declaration*, but very far was it from being so *Necessary* as the *Vindicator* would suggest. Perhaps he will say, that such a *Declaration* was then *Seasonable* and *Necessary* to allay the Clamours that were raised against the Clergy. If so, why is it not *Necessary* now for the same Reason to make another *Declaration*? For as long as the Clergy take that Authority upon them, which belongs to their *Sacred Function*; as long as they Preach against *Faction*, *Schism*, &c. according to the Doctrine and Principles of the Church of Ireland; They must expect to have Clamours raised, and Infamous Names of *Reproach* and *Distinction* cast upon them. But now, should the *Convocation* think it *Necessary*, to make a *Declaration* of their Principles, as often as Wicked and Unreasonable Men think fit to call them in Question, such *Declarations* would be daily *Necessary*: And all that would or could be made, would be to as little effect, as *That* already made. For I would fain know of the *Vindicator*, whether the same sort of Men are not as free with the Character of the Clergy since, as before the making of this *Declaration*; Nay, has it so much as stop'd his own foul Mouth? Is not He as virulent against the Clergy as ever?

Does

Does He not accuse some with defending a *Book*, which, he says, *Charges the whole Church with Schism, and both Church and State with Rebellion?* Does not He charge the *Members Pres. of the Convocation with Sinking that Book in the Committee*, tho' He himself was one of them? Would not He, when he says *Ibid.* that *Bishop Sheridan* thinks all the *Members of the Convocation* to be both *Rebels and Schismatics*, and *some of them more so than Others*; Would not he, I say, insinuate that those *Others* are greater *Favourers* of that *Bishop's Notions*, than they ought to be? Are not some represented to be *Beginners and Pag. 27. Managers of Clubs*, for forming a new set of *Principles*, in which the *Youth of the Kingdom* are to be instructed in *gratitude and respect to our greatest Benefactor*; And all this, notwithstanding this *Seasonable and Necessary Declaration*. For the *Vindicator's* use I will here Print the *Declaration* it self, that He may compare, and see how his own Behaviour agrees with it.

Die Sabbati 2^{da}. Die Mensis Junij, 1705.
**Resolutions of the Arch-Bishops, Bishops, and
 Clergy, in Convocation Assembled.**

RESOLVED, That this Church and Nation, having lately been in the utmost Danger of being over-run by Popery and Tyranny, were happily deliver'd from Both, by means of the late Revolution, brought about (under God's Providence) by His late Majesty King William the Third, of Glorious Memory.

Resolved, That the Continuance and Improvement of these Blessings are due (next under God) to the Auspicious Reign and Happy Government of Her Majesty Queen Anne, whom Almighty God long Preserve.

Resolved, That the Future Security and Preservation of this Church and Nation, depend wholly (under God) on the Succession of the Crown, as it is now Settled by Law, in the Protestant Line.

Resolved, That if any Clergy Man of this Church shall either by Word or Writing, declare any thing in Opposition to the foregoing Resolutions, (which we hope will never happen) We shall look upon him as a Sower of Divisions among the Protestants of the Established Church, and as an Enemy to our Constitution.

And after this Publick and Solemn Declaration, we hope no Person whatever will be so Unjust and Uncharitable, as to Declare, or Insinuate, that the Clergy of the Church of Ireland, as

by Law Established, were not sincere in their Affections for the late King William of Glorious Memory; or, are not in the true Interest of the present Government; or, that they are any way Disaffected to the Succession in the Protestant Line, as by Law Established.

Resolved, That for any Person to Teach, or Preach against the Doctrine, Government, Rites, or Ceremonies of this Church; or to keep up and Maintain Schools, and Seminaries for the Education of Youth in Principles contrary to those of the Established Church; is a Contempt of the Ecclesiastical Laws of this Kingdom, is of pernicious Consequence, and serves only to continue and widen the unhappy Schisms and Divisions in this Nation.

How well the Vindicator has in this his notable Performance answer'd the Hopes and Expectation of the Synod, I leave it to every Member of the Convocation to consider. But He perhaps thinks that he may make as free with the Synod as he pleases: That Body is become the Object of his Scorn and Contempt. And therefore I will here Present him with the Resolutions of the House of Commons, much to the same purpose, which passed that House, *Nemine contradicente*, the day before. The Letter-Writer may possibly think These also to be Seasonable and Necessary, and They may have as much a greater Influence upon him, than the Resolutions of the Synod; as He seems to have a greater Regard for his Temporal than for his Spiritual Interest.

Veneris Die Junij, 1^o. 1705.

RESOLVED, That to Suggest by Words or Writing, that the Established Church is not well Affected to the Succession of the Crown in the Protestant Line, as settled by Acts of Parliament; or any way inclined to countenance Popery; is a False and Malicious Aspersion, and tends to create a Dangerous Division amongst Protestants, and to promote the Designs of Papists and Traitors in favour of the Pretended Prince of Wales.

Resolved, That the Erecting and Continuing any Seminary for the Instruction and Education of Youth in Principles contrary to the Established Church and Government, tends to create and perpetuate Misunderstandings amongst Protestants.

Resolved, That saying Mass, Preaching or Teaching in separate Congregations, by Persons who have not taken the Oath of Abjuration, and Hearing, Maintaining, and Countenancing such Persons

Jan tends to Defeat the Succession of the Crown in the Protestant Line, and to Encourage and Advance the Interest of the pretended Prince of Wales.

Resolved, That all Judges and Magistrates are under the highest Obligation, to make most diligent Enquiry into all such Wicked Practices, and do their utmost Endeavour to discover and punish the Authors of them; and such as wilfully neglect the same, ought to be lookt upon as Enemies to Her Majesty's Government and the Prosperity of this Kingdom.

Will the *Vindicator*, after this, presume to go on with his False and Groundless Insinuations against the Clergy? Will he be so Unjust and Uncharitable, in the modest Language of the Synod? and Guilty of a False and Malicious Aspersions, tending to create a dangerous Division amongst Protestants, and to promote the Designs of Papists and Traitors, in favour of the pretended Prince of Wales, as the Honourable House of Commons have expressed it?

The Remarker had said with great Truth, that he never Pag. 25. heard of any one Person (not of the Convocation only, but of the Beneficed Clergy all over the Kingdom) that ever stood charged, with any one Word or Action, that could in the least argue him to be Disaffected to the Government, and the Succession. Which Assertion, the *Vindicator* says, the Remarker presumes no Body will Pag. 17. have the Impudence to contradict; and He most heartily wishes it may never be called in Question by any Man. No, the Remarker does not presume that no Body will have the Impudence to contradict it, for he knows how far the Impudence of some People will carry them; but he presumes that no Body will be able to contradict it with any Reason, and so as to make the contrary appear. And as for the *Vindicator's* Wish, that it may never be called in question; I think it carries with it a sly Insinuation, that if it should be called in question, it would not be able to stand the Test. And yet, had it not been true, He knows One as well as he knows Himself, who had good Nature enough, and was well enough affected towards the Clergy to call it in Question.

The Letter-Writer was forced at last to own (so powerful Par. 31. is Truth) that there was a Perfect Unity and Harmony between the Two Houses: and that they had always a mutual Trust and Confidence in each other. This the Remarker compares with those Scandalous, Groundless Stories, which the Letter-Writer had told

told concerning their Struggles and Quarrels; particularly what he had invented in the Affair of the *Virger*, and the *Vice-Prolocutor*, and takes notice of his Inconsistency.

Pag. 18. And what says the *Vindicator* to this? *Must it destroy all Unity between Parents and Children, if the Fathers take upon them to admonish their Children, or to correct them for their Errors? Or, if the Children modestly claim from their Parents what they judge to be their Right?* But has He represented the Fathers only admonishing their Children, or the Children modestly claiming from their Parents? No, he would have the World think, that We were flying in the Face of our Parents: and our Parents are accordingly represented as ready to Discard Us, to turn Us out of Doors, and to have no farther Correspondence with Us. This is a pretty Idea of *Perfect Unity and Harmony*. And indeed the *Vindicator* himself seems upon second thoughts to be sensible of this his Inconsistency, and is for recalling those words: and pleads for his Excuse, that *Perfect Unity and Harmony* were Words transcribed out of the Paper of Mr. Percivale and Mr. Higgins, and therefore should not have been fixt so absolutely on the Writer of the Letter. Those Two Members are obliged to him for doing their Paper so much Honour, as to transcribe any thing out of it; and yet, tho' the Words might originally have been *Theirs*, He by the Use and Application of them, has now made them his own, and as such is accountable for the Truth of them. But let him leave out the Words *Perfect Unity and Harmony*, since he says they are none of his own, and then let him try whether He can make any Sense of that Paragraph.

Par. 9. The Letter-Writer was pleased to observe, that the present Lower House had constant Recourse for all Matters (except those of the Rights) to the Synodus Anglicana, and in every Debate, submitted to the Decision of that Book, which lay constantly on the Table; That this Book never lay upon the Table, the Remarker could no more say, than if the Letter-Writer had affirm'd it of any other Book whatsoever; but every other part of his Assertion, as that it lay constantly there, as a Rule and Direction for our Proceedings, he was well able to deny: The Point in Dispute is reduced to a short Issue, and the Reader will allow that the Members are the proper Judges in this Case. Hear then the Resolution which the Committee came to upon this part of the Letter.

Resolved,

Resolved, That the House never had any Recourse to the Synodus Anglicana, nor in any Debates submitted to the Decision of that Book, nor did it ever lie on the Table by Order of the House.

Notwithstanding this *Vote* of the Committee, the *Vindicator* still insists upon the Truth of his Assertion, and will name, *App. P.* if required, several Learned and Worthy Members, together with the xxxiii. Actuary and his Assistant, who will justify as much as the Letter-Writer has affirm'd on that Subject. Now, since I read the *Vindication*, I have had an Opportunity of consulting the Actuary; and He tells me, that Dr. Lambert had been both with him, and his Assistant, and would fain have got a Certificate under their hands, for the truth of what he had asserted, but They both positively refused it: That the Book has been upon the Table, the Actuary remembers, and that he used to look into it sometimes for his own amusement, but how it came in, or how it got out of the House He knows not. Now, is this justifying as much as the Letter-Writer had affirm'd on that Subject? But the *Vindicator* appeals also, to every disinterested Member of the House: *Ibid.* Why does not he tell us, who those Disinterested Members are? He would insinuate that the Members of the Committee (that is, the whole House, for he knows that every Member had a *Vote* in it) were interested against Him. By the Learned and Worthy Members, I suppose, he means those, Who, in another Place he says, will gratefully acknowledge, that Book to have been their Guide and Tutor in most of their Methods and Manner of doing Business; But what is This to the Honour that the Letter ascribes to it? Which is, not that the Letter-Writer's Worthy and Learned Members made it their Guide and Tutor: But that the present Lower-House had constant Recourse to it, and in every Debate submitted to the Decisions of it. *Pag. 25.*

The three last General Observations in the Letter, he says, are so shiftingly managed by the Remarker, as plainly discovers that he is forc'd to a slight of hand, and to cast a mist before the Eyes of his Reader. What He means by these expressions, I shall not much trouble my self to examine: The Remarker has fairly laid down the Letter-Writer's own Words, and given his Thoughts of them, and where they have not been founded upon Truth, He has plainly told him so. Particularly to his Observation, that the Upper-House Book of 1661, had only *Pag. 27.*

Pag. 35. *an Account of what passed in that House, He says that it is not true; for this plain Reason, because it has not only an Account of what passed in that House, but it has also preserved some Account of what passed in the Lower-House. And He instanced particularly the Account which that Book has preserved, as to the Usage of the Lower-House, in the point of Intermediate Sessions.*

That this Book of the Upper-House affords Light enough to justify this Practice in the Lower-House, the *Vindicator* can't deny. But He says, that the Remarker sends his Reader to nothing more in that Book, but to one Paper offer'd by the then Lower-House to the Upper, which Paper bears Date on a Day that the Upper did not Sit. And, upon this one Figure of the Day of the Month depend all the Precedents, and all the Strength of the Remarks. Now, if the Remarker has sent his Reader to Nothing more than to One Paper; was not that sufficient to destroy the *Vindicator's* General Assertion? I have learn'd in Logick, that the Negation of One particular is enough to destroy the Truth of an Universal Proposition. But why must all the Strength of the Remarks depend upon this One Figure of the Day of the Month? What does he think of the Testimony of Two living Witnesses? The Remarks would have been too Strong for him, even if that One Figure, as He calls it, had been changed into another. But, why must this One Figure be used with so much Contempt? Is He ignorant that Writings of the greatest Consequence often depend upon the Strength of One Figure? What Work would this Gentleman make with Deeds and Settlements, if He should be let loose in the World, with a Power to alter but One Figure in the Date of them? Especially, if He should happen to manage Shifingly, and with a slight of hand, and so as to cast a Mist before the Eyes of his Reader. And much greater Havock would He make, if He should alter such Dates, as are written in Words at length, and not in Figures; which is the Case of the Date before Us. For it is expressed, *Acta Die Septimo Augusti*, without any Figure; as He may see in *Partiality Detected*, Page 103.

Ibid.

Another of his Observations was, That He never heard it alledged or pretended, that any Member of either of the present Houses ever quoted any Discourse, or Observation, or Proceeding in the Lower-House of 1661, from any Person who had been a Member of it; Upon which the Remarker put him in Mind, that his Grace the Archbishop of Tuam, had Quoted some Proceedings of that

that *Lower-House*, and that He had been a Member of It, and was now a Member of One of the present Houses. To which the *Vindicator* replies, that the Writer of the Letter, does not remember to have heard his Grace quoted in the *Lower-House*. Whether He remembers this or no, in his *Letter-Writer's Capacity*, I will not determine: But, I think it will be sufficient to my purpose to prove that Dr. Lambert could not but remember it. And for this I appeal to the *Vindicator* himself, who tells us, that the Doctor had not his Account of the *Proceedings* in the *Lower-House* in 1661, either from his Grace of Tuam, or Bishop Sheridan; but that that part of the *Preface*, which mentions *strict inquiry into the Usages of former Convocations from such Persons as were best able to inform*, was collected from the Debates of the House. I suppose the *Vindicator* will allow, that the Persons here mentioned *as best able to inform*, were his Grace of Tuam, and Bishop Sheridan; If therefore the Doctor came to a knowledge of their Sentiments concerning the *Usages of former Convocations*, not from themselves in Person, but from the Debates of the House; he can't but remember to have heard them Quoted in the *Lower-House*. Pag. 28.

What He has observed about the *Abundance of Pains, Art and Industry used, to make the Clergy apprehensive of Dangerous Designs*, shall be consider'd in a proper Place. It may suffice at present, that I have shewn three of his wise Observations, viz. that *We had constant Recourse to the Synodus Anglicana*; that the *Upper-House Book of 1661* has only an Account of what passed in that House; and that He never heard his Grace of Tuam Quoted, to be utterly Groundless. And yet the *Vindicator* is so hardy as to affirm, that *there is scarce a Word or an Argument offer'd to disprove either the Truth or Sufficiency of all the Observations*; And he Charges the Remarker with want of *Ingenuity and Modesty*, for calling them in Question. Pag. 31.

The chief Design of the *Letter-Writer* appears plainly to be to Vilify and Bespatter the *Convocation*, as much as possibly he can. Had his Intent been only to Write against the *Two Members*, he would have confined himself to the Subject of their Paper, and endeavoured to have proved that the *Facts* contained in it, were otherwise than They had represented them. There was no way of Answering them pertinently but this, and yet this has been the least part of his Care; He has indeed here and there attempted it, and yet not one single Fact has he been able

to disprove; but instead of it, takes Refuge and Shelter in flying to the *Rights*, upon which those *Facts* were supposed to be founded. This the *Remarker* has shewn not to be the Question, for that the *Two Members* have given an account of *Facts* only.

But supposing the *Two Members* had said, that We do not only enjoy these *Usages de Facto*, but that we had also a Title to them *de Jure*; even then the *Letter-Writer* ought to have stuck to those *Rights* thus supposed to have been Asserted by the *Two Members*: But instead of that, He makes it his Business to prove all our Proceedings to have been nothing but Usurpations; that we have not had the Advantage of any *Papers*, or any *experienced Person* to direct us; Nay, that our *whole Meeting* has been nothing but a Riotous Assembly, Sitting and Acting without any *Legal Authority*. These are the great Things which the *Letter-Writer* pretends to; these the Methods he has taken to gain the Hearts of all those who are not Well-wishers to our *Constitution*. But blessed be God, we do not lie at the Mercy of this Gentleman; it has been proved beyond all contradiction, That we have not only Met and Acted upon a *Legal Foundation*, but also that our Proceedings have had as solid Grounds, as the Nature of the Thing would admit of, or as indeed was necessary; that we had a Record of the last *Convocation* to direct us, the Testimony of *some* who had been *Members* of the last *Convocation* to inform us, and Tender and Affectionate *Fathers* of the *Upper House* to Advise and Support us.

And because the *Remarker* understood that the *Letter-Writer* was an Intimate and Bosome Friend of Dr. *Lambert's*, He therefore directed him to the Doctor for Information, whether we had not those Grounds for our Practice, which the *Remarker* had Asserted. For it was well known, how industrious the Doctor was in searching into the *Records* both of *Parliament* and *Convocation*, and in putting the *House* upon *Claims* in pursuance of what he had there found. It was well known, that he had the greatest hand in the *Claim of Rights*, and was therefore solely imploy'd by the *House* to draw up the *Preface* to them.

Now one would have thought, that if the *Letter-Writer* could have had any Objection against this, it would have been against the Doctor, as a *Partial* and *Prejudiced Person*; as being the Man that put the *House* upon the *Claim* of most of those *Rights*, which the *Letter-Writer* Disclaims: Nay, He endeavoured

voured to put the *House* upon the *Claim* of some, which they, finding there were not sufficient *Grounds* for them, would not meddle with. He it was that occasion'd the *Debate* about the *Virger*; that started the *Objection* and insisted that no *Message* ought to be received from the *Upper House*, but what should come by their *Actuary*. He it was that *Moved* and *Insisted*, that the *Lower House* has not only a Right to pronounce their *Members Contumacious*, but even to *Expel* them, if They should see cause. No Man was more intent than He, upon the *Right of Adjourning separately*; nor was any Man so Noisy, when the *Form of Adjournment* was first changed. It is well known how Importunate and Troublesome He was in *pressing Business*, and in *resenting* it of the *Upper House*, that so little was done; and in using what *Methods and Management* he was capable of, to render their *Lordships* suspected in the Eyes of the People, for not doing more; Insomuch, that he was *publickly accused* in the *House* for *Traducing* the *Bishops*, and *Opposing* the *Rights and Privileges* of the *Upper House* upon all occasions. These and such like, one would have thought in reason, might have been objected by the *Letter-Writer*, why He should not stand to the *Appeal* made to *Dr. Lambert*.

But it seems the *Letter-Writer* was sent to the wrong Person for satisfaction in this Affair; For his *Vindicator* tells us, that He is impower'd to do the Doctor Justice, and to call that *Pag. 30.*
Preface, a formidable Bug-bear, that does not affect him; and yet, that he has Integrity and Courage enough to own it.

He is also impower'd to tell, that the *Dr. neither consulted his* *Pag. 31.*
Grace of Tuam, nor searched into the single Record which remains of the Upper House in 1661, nor was as diligent as other Members in searching into the Records of Parliament and Convocation; but yet, that he was as Zealous for passing the Claim of *Pag. 30.*
Rights as any Man in the House.

He is impowered moreover to tell the World (and a Pity it is that it should not be known, tho' it be not much to the present purpose) that the Doctor has had the Honour of being frequently commanded by the House, to draw up many of their Papers, and the good Fortune to meet with their Approbation of most that he drew. Ibid.

But, above all He is impower'd to tell, (and, Reader, it is worthy of thy Attention) that the Doctor was always above be- Ibid.
ing

ing corrupted or frightened into a Betraying of the Rights of the Lower-House.

Pag. 30. In short, *He* is Impower'd to tell, that the Doctor in that Preface, did not Express his own Sense, but the Sense of the House; and therefore not *He*, but the House is responsible for the Matter contain'd in it.

But now, I desire to know, whether *He* did not give his Assent to this Preface, when it passed the House? I believe he will not deny but that *He* did; and if so, is not his own Sense expressed in it, as well as the Sense of the House? How then comes the *Vindicator* to say, That the Doctor in that Preface did not express his own, but the Sense of the House? Pag. 35. And how is it, that *He* challenges the Remarker to shew in what One Matter of Moment he has changed his Opinion, since he drew up that Preface. The Remarker accepts of his Challenge, and undertakes to shew a few Matters of Moment, in which he has changed his Opinion, since he drew up that Preface.

He was then of Opinion, that We had good and solid Grounds to proceed upon, in the Claim of our Rights and Privileges; *He* now scarce allows Us to have any at all. *He* then was of Opinion, that We were a Lawful Convocation; but now *He* thinks us to be an Illegal Assembly. *He* then was of Opinion, that We might hold Intermediate Sessions; but now *He* thinks We ought not. *He* then was of Opinion, that the Lower-House had a Power to pronounce refractory Members Contumacious, Nay, and even to expel them the House; But now he thinks it a Crime so much as to Name the Word Contumacious. It would be endless to go thro' all the Particulars; I can't think that *He* will be so hardy as to deny either that *He* has changed his Opinion in these Matters; or to say, that there is not One of them a Matter of Moment.

Ibid. Indeed *He* has One irrefragable Argument, and worthy of so accurate a Logician, to prove that *He* has not chang'd his Opinion: The Doctor's Opinion, says *He*, upon some of the most important points is Printed and Published by the Remarker in an Address to the Bishops, Page xii. of his Appendix. That Address is said to be intirely of the Doctor's drawing up, and *He* desires to know in what particulars *He* has declined or deviated from it. I never heard it said before, that that Address was of the Doctor's drawing up; However there is nothing in it above the Doctor's Capacity, and for Argument's sake, I will allow

allow it to be his. Now suppose *He* had never deviated from the particulars in that *Address*, (the subject matter of which is the necessity of having the *Provincial Writ* to form us into a *Convocation*) does it follow that *He* never changed his Opinion, in other matters? If *He* has not changed his Opinion in One particular point, Does it follow that *He* has changed it in None? *He* must have a very mean Opinion of his Reader, if he hopes to put such a poor *Fallacy*, as this, upon him.

And after all, how shall we know the *Doctor's* Opinion by this *Address*, supposing it to be drawn up by him? It may express the Sense of the *Members* and not *his own*, according to the *Vindicator*. But, if this *Address* must be presumed to express *his Sense*, because *He* drew it up, why must not the *Preface* be presumed also to express *his Sense* for the same Reason?

And indeed, can it be imagined that the *Members* should imploy *One* to put their Sense into Writing, who was not fully of the same Opinion with them? Or, would they not rather pitch upon *One* who had shewn a more than Ordinary Zeal, and Earnestness for It? This Zeal it was, and this alone, that induced the *House* to imploy Dr. *Lambert* particularly in that Affair; it was not that *He* had either an abler *Head* or a better *Pen* than others, as *He* vainly insinuates in many Pages of his *Pamphlet*.

I can scarce think the *Vindicator* in Earnest, when *He* says, that the Remarker's true Design in Transcribing that whole Preface, was to insinuate, that the Paper of the Two Members is the same in effect and substance, with those Rights and Privileges claim'd by the Lower-House. Had this been the Remarker's Design, *He* would have Transcribed the Claim it self, and not the Preface only. But, the *Vindicator* goes on and says, excepting the Case of Intermediate Sessions, there is scarce any other Agreement between the Claim of Rights, and the Paper of the Two Members: *He* might as well have said, that there is scarce any Agreement between that Paper, and the Records of Parliament; it would have been as much to his Purpose. Can't Two Papers be each of them true, without agreeing or being the same in Effect and Substance? But, does the Paper disagree with the Claim of Right, so as to contradict any part of it? If *He* proves this, then indeed *He* says something to his purpose of

of vilifying the *Convocation*, for then it will appear that the Practice of the House has been disagreeable to their *Pre-tensions* and *Claims*. And thus he proves the *Paper* and the

Pag. 32. *Claim to Disagree*; the *Claim of Right*, says he, asserts that the Provincial Writ, as well as the *Præmunientes* Clause, is necessary to the very Being of a *Convocation*; The *Paper* supposes a Right to Meet, &c. on the *Præmunientes* Clause only. The *Paper* supposes no such thing: Why does not He shew where it supposes it? Again, that *Paper* asserts several *Acts* done of Right by the *Prolocutor*, before his Confirmation; not one Word of which is in the *Claim of Rights*. How then does it Disagree with the *Claim of Rights*? But does the *Paper* assert several *Acts* done of Right? &c. The *Paper* asserts no such Thing, it asserts indeed that several *Acts* were done, but says nothing of Right; these Words are inserted here by the *Vindicator* to serve a Turn. Had the *Two Members* been ask'd about it, they would have said, that those *Acts* had been done of Right, and they could have proved it: But the *Lower House* in *England* desired an Account of *Facts* only, without enquiring after the *Rights* upon which those *Facts* were founded. Well,

Ibid. but He goes on; that *Paper* insists on many *Usages* and *Practices* of the *Lower-House*, in which the *Claim of Right* is utterly Silent. If the *Claim* be utterly Silent, How does it appear to Disagree with the *Paper*? If I affirm one thing, and my Friend affirms the contrary, then it will be evident that we Disagree; But if I Affirm, and my Friend is Silent, must that Silence be taken for a Note of his Disagreeing with me? and so spoil a good old English Proverb, which says, that *Silence gives Consent*?

Ibid. The *Vindicator* having brought off his Friend the *Letter-Writer*, is now hastning to the Assistance of his other Friend the Author of *Partiality Detected*. And happy that Gentleman is in having so able a Champion to defend him. That

Pag. 35. Author had only ask'd (says the *Vindicator*) with what *Ingenuity* the *Two Members* could affirm, that the *Lower-House* enjoy'd all those several *Rights* and *Privileges*, without the least Struggle, Contest or Difference with the *Bishops*. And will the *Vindicator* say, that that Author only ask'd This? Did not He also in the same Sentence, charge the *Lower House* with want of *Ingenuity*, for Recognizing what the *Two Members* had asserted? His words are these; The Reader will see by this Account (i. e. the *Letter Writer's* Account) with what *Ingenuity* it is Attested by

by the Two Members, and Recognized by the Majority of a thin House in Ireland; that they enjoy'd all those *several Rights and Privileges*, without the least Struggle, Contest, or Difference with their Graces and Lordships. Upon which the Remarker challenges Him to give an Instance in any One Right or Privilege mentioned in that Paper, about which He had the least Struggle, Contest, or Difference with their Graces and Lordships. And He hopes this Gentleman will either make good his Charge, or else think himself obliged to make some Satisfaction to the Reputation of so many worthy Persons, whom He has here publicly traduced. Pag. 41.

The *Vindicator* appears for Him, accepts the Challenge, and undertakes to make the Accusation good. And what, says he, if I should instance some few in behalf of the absent Author? What does the Remarker think of choosing a Prolocutor, and claiming a Right to do business by Virtue of the *Præmunientes Clause* only? Would not the Bishops (does he think) contend that Right with him? Now I will allow the *Vindicator* which side of the Question he pleases, and still what the Remarker has asserted will be true. Does it follow, that there were actually Contests and Differences with the Bishops about Rights enjoy'd by the Lower-House, because there might have been Contests, in case the Lower-House had claim'd some which they never pretended to? He goes on; Does he believe that the Bishops allow the Prolocutor to Act before he be Confirm'd by their Lordships? Yes, as much as the Paper represents Him to have Acted. That part of the Paper He acknowledges in his Letter to be truly Stated; and he well knows that we had no manner of Contest or Difference about it. Again; Do my Lords the Bishops allow the sole Right of judging Controverted Elections to be in the Lower House only? Do their Lordships allow, without Contest, a Right of Declaring and Pronouncing Members Contumacious in the Lower House? Now, whether these things may come to be disputed hereafter the Remarker knows not; but nothing is more certain, than that hitherto there has been no Contest or Difference about them. Ibid. Par. 18.

And now, what will the Reader think of this Gentleman's way of Reasoning? The point in Debate is this; Whether there has been any Contest between the Two Houses, in relation to the Rights, which the Paper says were enjoy'd by the Lower House: The Two Members affirm there has not, the Author of P. D. charges them, and the Lower House with Disingenuity for saying so; and the *Vindicator* undertakes to prove the

the Charge, and to give some Instances of *Contest* that have happened on these occasions. It is therefore the Business of the *Vindicator* to name some One Right, mentioned by that Paper to have been enjoyed by the Lower House, and then to shew that there was a *Struggle* and *Contest* with the Bishops about it. There is no other way of answering pertinently but this, and yet this he does not so much as attempt; notwithstanding which, in the Close he insults as much, as if he had really proved his Point. These, says he, are some few Instances out of that short Paper, which I would almost appeal even to the Remarker himself, if he believes, that the Bishops will give up and part with to the Lower House, without any *Struggle* or *Contest*. Now the Remarker believes, that as there never has been, so there never will be any *Contest* between the Bishops and the Lower House, about any thing contain'd in that short Paper: But supposing there should be ever so great *Contests* hereafter, still the Assertion in the Paper would be undeniably true, that hitherto there has been none.

The *Vindicator* charges the Remarker with having called the Author of *Partiality Detected*, a Publick Traducer; without any Tolerable Proof, that he has at all Traduced or Misrepresented any Person or Action whatsoever. The Remarker thinks that he has more than Tolerable Proof, that this Author has publickly Traduced the Lower House of Ireland: For to charge them publickly with want of Ingenuity, and with Recognizing Assertions that are False, is to Traduce them publickly. And when the *Vindicator* brings Instances of their Disingenuity, which he has promised, but has hitherto fail'd in, the Remarker will then make this Gentleman Amends for what he has said.

But the *Vindicator*, waving the true Point in Debate, says, that the least that that Author can do, is to beg pardon of so many worthy Gentlemen for Traducing them, and saying they were barely a Majority; as if that had been all he had said of them, and had not charged them with the Reproach of Disingenuity.

Upon his mentioning the Majority of a thin House, the Remarker slightly took Notice, that He might have said the large Majority of a thin House; the Letter Writer himself allowing that. And indeed so large, says he, it was, that the same Number would have made a Majority even in a very full House. This the *Vindicator*, after his blundering way, makes merry with. By this, says he, We are to learn, that a greater Number is a Majority

as well in a very full House, as in a thin One. How comes this Gentleman to learn this weighty Truth from those words of the *Remarker*? What new *Argument* does He make use of? *Logick* indeed I have not of late expected of him, but I little thought that He could be thus deficient in Common *Arithmetick*. Now if He pleases to attend, I will explain to him, what those intricate words of the *Remarker* import. Suppose therefore the Majority of a *thin House* (consisting in all of but 29,) to be so large as to consist of 28, that same Number (*viz.* 28) would make a Majority in a full House (suppose of 55.) But how to gather from the words the wise Truth which the *Sagacious Vindicator* has pick'd out of them I can't imagine. For the Majority in a *thin House* may be so small, that the same Number may not make a Majority in a full House: Thus 15 would be a Majority in a *thin House* consisting of 29, and yet that Number would not be a Majority in a fuller House consisting of 31. I hope the Reader will pardon this Trifling, and make Allowances for the unhappy circumstances I am under of having to deal with a Man, who, if I do not Answer him in every thing, will boast that I have Answered him in Nothing.

The same Author had ask'd, *How the Two Gentlemen of P. 102:*
Ireland could give in the Choice of their own Actuary, as One of
the *Rights and Usages of the Lower-House* there? And tell Us
particularly, that it was made before the Confirmation of the Pro-
locutor? Upon which, the *Remarker* reminded that Author, *Pag. 41:*
that the Two Gentlemen of Ireland gave in their Paper an ac-
count of *Facts only*, without saying upon what Right any the least of
them were founded; and yet He is far from thinking, that the
Right must shift for itself, as the *Vindicator* Represents it; For
the Truth of this Fact particularly He appealed to the *Members*
of the *Lower-House*, and to the *Journals of the same House*, and
even to the *Letter-Writer* himself; who, it seems, had in his
Letter Confirm'd and Recognized this part of the *Paper*, now
called in Question by this Author. Here the *Vindicator* is
at a stand; should He deny that the *Actuary* was chosen be-
fore the Confirming of the *Prolocutor*, He would contradict
the *Letter-Writer*; should He own it, He would fly in the
Face of this Author. And therefore He very wisely waves it, *Pag. 37:*
and only says, that the *Remarker* is most palpably Mistaken, for
saying that the Two Members gave an Account of *Facts only*, with-
out saying upon what Right those *Facts* were founded. Now, that
they

they undertake to give an Account of *Rights* also, He proves out of the *Preface* of the *Paper*, which mentions *Rights* and *Usages* enjoy'd; and adds, that the Archdeacon would have thought himself obliged in Honour, when He was forming *Precedents* to justify and maintain the *Rights* of another House, to have accounted as well for the *Rights* as the *Facts* of his own.

The Archdeacon was not so presuming as to pretend to form *Precedents* for another House. He barely related some *Facts* that had been transacted in the House, of which He has the Honour to be a *Member*, and nothing more. He pretended indeed to give an account of *Rights* and *Usages* enjoy'd and practis'd; and how *Rights* and *Usages*, consider'd only as enjoy'd and Practis'd, differ from *Facts*, I am yet to learn. Why does not the *Vindicator* give some one Instance, where they have insisted upon a *Right* as such? They say, that the *Members* of the *Convocation* were Summoned, Elected and Return'd by Virtue of the *Premunientes*; that upon the Reception of the *Provincial Writ*, they proceeded to the Election of a *Prolocutor*; that *Committees* were appointed; that they held *Intermediate Sessions*; &c. without saying one word of the *Right* upon which these, and the other *Facts*, mention'd in the *Paper*, were supposed to be Founded. Had the *Lower House* in *England* desired it of them, the *Two Members* might very probably have given them an Account of the *Right*, as well as of the *Facts*. They were well able to do it, had there been any Occasion for it; as yet there has been none. And therefore these *Rights* are not left to shift for themselves, but may be taken for Undoubted, for any thing that either the *Letter-Writer*, or his *Vindicator* has as yet been able to say against them.

SECT. IV.

In which are consider'd the Vindicator's Unjust and Groundless Reflections upon the Remarker and Others.

I Have been often puzzled to find out whether the *Vindicator* takes most Pleasure in Commending Himself, or in Railing at Others. These seem to be his *Two Darling Things*; when either of these come in his way, He is more than ordinarily

harily Delighted and Transported with it. With exquisite Complacency and Satisfaction, no doubt, it was, that He writ the first Paragraph of his *Vindication*, for there his Two beloved *Topicks* are both insisted on. The *Remarker* is represented to be the worst of Men, and the *Letter-Writer* to be the best of Christians.

The first thing, says he, that is most eminently Remarkable in *Pag. 1.* the Remarks, is so much Scurrilous, Malicious, Unchristian Railing against his supposed Adversary, as scarce ever was crouded into so few Sheets before. The *Letter-Writer* heartily forgives the Injury design'd him by it, and earnestly prays God to forgive the Injury done to his Church by practices so unbecoming One of its Ministers. How heartily he Forgives will appear anon; in the mean time He appeals to the World, whether the *Letter* has given any just Occasion for so much Passion and Virulence. The *Remarker* is not sensible that he has expressed himself with either Passion or Virulence. No, what ill Treatment soever the *Letter-Writer* might have deserved, yet, for his own sake, the *Remarker* abstain'd from any Language that did not become his Character. He fairly took the *Letter* to pieces, and shew'd the many Falshoods and Absurdities of it; and this he did with as much Calmness and Temper, as the nature of the thing would admit of. But I have heard of some, who are so little Philosophers, as to imagine those Sensations, which are raised in them by any Object, to be really in the Object it self that raises them; And thus the *Vindicator* fancies, that there must needs be Passion and Virulence in the Remarks, because the Remarks have raised Passion and Virulence in him. As well may a Child say, that there is Pain in a Rod, and Pleasure in an Apple, because a Rod and an Apple affect him with those Sensations.

As for his Appeal to the World, the *Remarker* is very willing to stand by it; and certainly that part of the World, which is best capable of judging in this Controversy (that is, the Members of the Lower House of Convocation) have already, by the Resolutions which they have passed against the *Letter*, very manifestly declared, that there was just Occasion for greater Resentments than the *Remarker* has expressed against it.

But why does not the *Vindicator* give some Instances of this great Passion and Virulence, of this Scurrilous, Malicious, Unchristian Railing, of those Scurrilous Reflections, and that *Slam* *Pag. 3.* der and Insultance, which he charges the *Remarker* with? He *Pag. 5.* complains

complaints that the *Remarker* has inserted in his *Journal* all the *Scurrilous* and *Virulent* that a bad Cause necessarily requires; and that he has shewn how inimitable a Talent he has at this *Christian-Gentleman-like-way* of Writing; and that he has furiously poured out Indignation and

Pag. 35. *Resentment* against him. And again, the *Remarker* may *Bully* Dr. Lambert and the Letter-Writer, with all the Efforts of his Talent that way, but They value not all his little *Scurrilities*. One would think, after all this, that the *Doctor* would produce some Passages out of the *Remarks* chargeable with all this *Virulence* and *Scurrility*; but I do not find that he has mentioned any Particular, except One, which I meet with in *Pag. 19.* and that is the word *False*; which he says the *Remarker* very *Bluntly* charges upon him. Now since this offends him, the *Remarker* promises, that He will lay aside that Word intirely, if the *Vindicator* will but lay aside the Thing; or he will use a less *Blunt* One, if the *Vindicator* will but furnish him with another equally expressive.

But is it this One word, that has deserved all this foul Language? Or, if it be any thing else, why does not the *Vindicator* name it? Why does not he point to those *Scurrilous* and *Virulent* Expressions which offend him, that the *Remarker* may either Justifie or Renounce them? But this he has not thought fit to do, and yet he loads his Adversary with all the Reproaches that his Malice can invent; and rails at him in that very Language, which he would have thought to be the thing that has given him Offence; and all this, no doubt, is to shew how heartily he has forgiven the *Remarker*.

Par. 8. One of the *Letter-Writer's* Observations was, That before the Meeting of the present Convocation in Ireland, Abundance of Pains, Art, and Industry were used, to make many of the Clergy of that Kingdom, apprehensive of dangerous Designs then forming against the Rights of the Church (in England.) Upon this the *Remarker* took notice, how disingeniously the *Letter-Writer* endeavoured to render the Clergy of Ireland obnoxious to Persons in Power, as Promoters of the Clambours concerning the Danger of the Church. He was aware that the *Letter-Writer* would excuse himself by saying, that he no where represents the Clergy as apprehensive of dangerous Designs then forming against the Church, but against the Rights of the Church; and it was allow'd

Pag. 33. that he so expressed himself in the Letter: But yet it was observ'd,

Pag. 34. that in the Margin he had set down [Great pains taken in Ireland

to propagate the Dangers of Church and Clergy] and again in the Table of Contents [Great Pains taken in Ireland to propagate the Dangers of the Church, before the Convocation met there.]

It seems, the *Remarker* was not out in his Conjecture; It is the very Excuse that the *Vindicator* makes. For He says, that *Pag. 25.* his Observation had only in view the Clamours which were raised against the Bishops of England, as encroaching on the Lower-House. But, has He at all accounted for his Marginal Reference, which the *Remarker* took notice of so justly? Nay, has not He since Re-printed it at the end of this very *Vindication*? And has He made one word of Apology for his Expressions to the same Purpose, in the Table of Contents?

It had been but just in him, after such a publick Accusation, to have descended to particulars; but so far was He from doing this, that He very fairly insinuated, that the whole Lower-Clergy ought to be understood by it. *It is not Necessary*, says He, *to tell Par. 8.* you under what influence, nor by what concurrent Accidents this Notion began to obtain: It is enough to say, that many did too readily entertain it; and consequently, that the Lower Clergy of Ireland, were under a strong Disposition to copy after the Majority of the Lower-House here (in England,) and to assume those for undoubted Rights and Privileges, which they saw so warmly claimed by their Brethren here, and all under Pretence of Zeal for the Establish'd Church.

Upon this, the *Remarker* desired him to be more open, and to tell plainly how and by whom this Abundance of Pains, Art, and Industry were used.

In answer to which the *Vindicator* replies. *Be it known then, Pag. 26.* Sir, to you and to all Men, that the Books writ in England by some of the Lower-Clergy there, were industriously spread and sent about here, in which the Bishops of England are directly charged with these Encroachments; that many who had seen these Books, had never seen or read the Answers to them; that to confirm the Truth of the Charge contain'd in them, Letters out of a certain Black Case were frequently produced, and read from some Members of the Lower-House there, aggravating the unjust Proceedings of the Bishops, and magnifying the Courage and Constancy of the Lower-Clergy in Opposing them. And this I hope is enough to shew how, and in what manner it was done.

He would here have the Reader imagine, that great Industry had been used in Ireland, in dispersing the Books written on the side of the Lower-House, in the Controversy depending between the Two Houses in England. Now, if any were industrious

industrious in thus dispersing the Books written on the *One* side, I doubt not but that there were Others as industrious in dispersing Those written on the *Other*. As for the *Remarker*, He was industrious in dispersing *Neither*; and yet He freely owns, that had it been in his Power, He would have been industrious in dispersing *Both*. For He thinks, that when a Controversy of this Nature is on Foot, that so nearly concerns the Ecclesiastical Constitution, no Men of Learning and Ingenuity, much less the Clergy, ought to be Strangers to it. And if (as the *Vindicator* says) *Many who had seen those Books (written on the side of the Lower House) had never seen or read the Answers to them*, the *Remarker* thinks it was their own fault; For the Press was open to both sides, and the Booksellers of *Dublin* were able to procure any of these Books for such as desired them.

As for what the *Vindicator* says, of *Letters being produc'd out of a certain Black Case*; Is it that they were produced out of a *Case*, or that the *Case* was *Black*, that the *Vindicator* is Offended? Happy it is for the *Remarker*, that how generally soever he has passed for a *Man of good Humour, Civility, and Manners*, yet He has never been so infatuated by those good Qualities, as to communicate Letters, out of any *Case*, to the *Vindicator*. For he that has such a discerning Faculty, as to find out Untruths, in the *Paper* of the *Two Members* Voted by the *House* to be a Just and True Representation, might have been provoked to have found out Treason, Blasphemy, or any thing else in the Letters of a *Scurrilous and Virulent Remarker*.

And now, according to the *Vindicator* himself, this is the whole of the *Abundance of Art, Pains, and Industry*, which he made such a Noise with, as if the Clergy were ready to remove the foundations of Church and State. This is the *Influence*, and These the *Concurrent Accidents* that strongly disposed the *Lower House* to assume certain Groundless Precarious Things, for undoubted Rights and Privileges, and all out of Zeal for the *Establish'd Church*.

He now comes to tell by whom this *Abundance of Pains, Art, and Industry* were used; He names no One, and yet promises to speak plain enough to be particularly understood. It was, He says, chiefly by those who used to lend the *Rehearsal*, and other healing Pamphlets of Mr. L——y's, such as the *Association*, and *Callandra*, and the *Translation of Mr. Craig's Book of Govern-*

Government from Hand to Hand, to improve them in their Notions of the Justice of the Revolution, and in their steady adherence to the Government.

Now I wish the *Vindicator* would tell, whether he has read the Books which he has here branded or not. If he has not read them, how does he know whether they deserve the scandalous Character which he here gives them? But if he has read them, I desire to be inform'd, why others may not be admitted to the same Liberty.

The *Revolution* proceeded upon such Reasonable and Necessary Grounds, that it is able to stand the Test of the nicest Scrutiny; and it is an unworthy Reflection in the *Vindicator* to suppose the contrary. The *Remarker* freely owns, that He has read heretofore several Pamphlets, which at the time of the *Revolution* came out against it; and the more he read of the Argument, the better he liked the *Revolution*, and was the more able to Defend it. And (if He may be permitted the same Liberty once, which the *Vindicator* takes almost in every Page, of speaking well of himself) He can say, that He himself very early Writ and Printed in Favour of it.

But now, since it is the *Vindicator's*, as well as his Dear Friend Dr. Synges Principle, that every Writing, as well as every Man, is presumed to be Good and True, till the contrary is made to appear, and since the *Vindicator* has not as yet pretended to make the contrary to appear; Ought not the Books, according to his own Principle, to be lookt upon to be Good and True? and if so, I hope it is no Crime to read them. Appen. Pag. 10.

But they were lent, he says, from Hand to Hand to improve them in their Notions of the Justice of the Revolution, and in their steady Adherence to the Government. Is it then a Fault to improve People in their Notions of the Justice of the Revolution, and in their steady Adherence to the Government? But if he speaks this Wittily and with an Irony, then I desire to know how he comes to make such an Uncharitable Construction, and to usurp the peculiar Prerogative of that God, who is the Searcher of all Hearts. Pag. 15. But is there nothing in these Books fit to be read and approved of by Men, who neither want a Notion of the Justice of the Revolution, nor a steady Adherence to the Government? Does not the *Rehearsal* unanswerably shew the Folly and Atheism of several Books of late Published against the Church and Constitution? Particularly, has it not taken to pieces that Blasphemous and Fantastical Book, falsely Entituled The

Rights of the Christian Church, and shewn the Fallacy and Weakness of its Reasonings? The other Pamphlets which He mentions are writ directly against the Rebellious Principles of *Forty One*; for that Reason it is, that the *Remarker* likes them, and perhaps it is for the same Reason that the *Vindicator* dislikes them.

As for Mr. Craig's Book of Government, (I suppose he means Sir Thomas Craig's *Right of Succession*) I never read it; But since the publishing of this Vindication, I have lookt over the Preface, and find it to be written by a Gentleman of Scotland, above a Hundred years ago, against *Doleman* the Jesuit; the Design of the Book was to promote the Union between the Two Kingdoms, which afterwards happen'd under K. James I. And I meet with such great Characters given to this Author, by several very learned Men, particularly by the present learned Bishop of Carlisle, who calls him *the Incomparable Craig*; that they have rais'd in me a great Curiosity to be acquainted with his Writings. This in particular I promise the *Vindicator* to read over very soon; and do not Despair to find it an Excellent Work, since he has thought fit to cast a Brand upon it.

Pag. 26. A Second sort, he says, are such who undertook the Publick Defence of Mr. Dodwell's Book of the Late Schism in England; Who these are he does not tell here, but in his Preface he Taxes the *Remarker* with having undertaken the Defence of that Book; Which, he says, charges the whole Church with Schism, and both Church and State with Rebellion.

Some years ago, this Book was complain'd of in the House, and it was refer'd to the Committee of Books to be examin'd; and it was said there, that since the Book was Written and Published in England, by a Person in England, and concerning an Affair that had happen'd in England, and since a Convocation was then sitting in England, it would be more proper to leave it to them, than for us to take Cognizance of it; And it was also moved, that, if they should think fit to take Cognizance of it, the Book might not be condemned in Gross, but that such Propositions as were Exceptionable might be extracted: But that either the *Remarker*, or any Body else undertook a Defence of it, I never heard. The *Remarker* is not of the same Principles with that Book, as the Author of it well knows, for some Letters pass'd between them

on the occasion of it. Had he been of that Authors Opinion, he would have join'd in the same Communion with him, rather than have lived in a State of Schism. For, whatever the *Vindicator* may think of it, the *Author* takes Schism to be a dreadful Sin, and will as long as he lives endeavour to avoid it.

But the *Vindicator* says, that this Book charges both Church and State with Rebellion; by which I have reason to think, that he has never read it, for I can't find one single Sentence in it tending, in the least, to Charge either Church or State with Rebellion. It is wholly taken up in an Ecclesiastical Controversy, and examines into the Extent of the Civil Power, as to the Deprivation of Bishops, without entering at all into the Controversy concerning the Title to that Power. It was indeed this Gentleman's Misfortune (to use his own Word) not to comply with the Revolution; but yet he never behaved himself so, as if he thought those to be Rebels who had complied with it; So far was he from this, that as he has received the Protection of the Government ever since, so he has lived quietly and peaceably under it. And what reproachful Usage soever this Gentleman may meet with from the *Vindicator*, yet He is so happy as to find a very different Treatment from many very considerable Persons, both in England and Ireland, and such as have shewn themselves upon all Occasions zealous Friends of the Revolution. Many such as these, I say, have so great a value for his Eminent Learning and Piety, that they have, both by Letters and otherwise, shewn him great Marks of their Esteem and Friendship; which I am confident they would not have done, if either they had look'd upon Him, or he upon Them to be Rebels.

But to come to the Point; the *Vindicator* says in his Preface, that *Artifices and Management* carried it so sink that Affair in a Committee that it should never afterwards come before the House. It seems then, that *Artifices and Management* were used formerly in Committees, as *Methods and Management* more lately. I never heard of any *Artifice* made use of; Nor did it otherwise sink, than that the Committee was of Opinion, that it was not proper to make any Report; nor did the House call for it. But, I pray, why did not the *Vindicator* call for a Report? Where then was this zealous Advocate? Why did He let pass uncensur'd a Book which (in his Opinion) charged the whole Church with Schism, and both Church and State with Rebellion?

Pag. 26. Another sort, He says, are *such as made Publick Reflections on the Bishops of England, & highly suspected for not being true Friends to the Church.* Who these are He does not declare. Had such publick Reflections been made, Others I suppose would have heard of them, as well as He; for *Publick Reflections* are not made in a Corner. And upon inquiry I cannot meet with one single Instance to justify this Accusation. It cannot therefore be look'd upon otherwise, than as a *Scandalous Libel* upon their *Lordships the Bishops of England*, to have it published to the World, that they were *highly suspected for not being true Friends to the Church*, and that they were *Publickly Reflected on* for it. But to go on.

Ibid

Another sort is *such who had the Confidence to bring into the Lower-House wet from the Press a Health to the Tackers, in way of a Ballad, and to sell them for Two pence a piece;* And did the *Vindicator* know any Person to behave himself with so much Levity and Disrespect to the *House*, and not reprove him for it? The *Remarker* was never in the *House* when any such Freedom was taken, Nor can He think that any *Member* would presume so far. The Authority of that *House* is not sunk so low, as to suffer such Indignities to go unpunish'd.

Pag. 27. The last sort which He mentions, is *such who were the Beginners and Managers of Clubs, for the forming a new sett of Principles, in which the Youth of this Kingdom were to be instructed, in Gratitude and Respect to our greatest Benefactor.*

And in many places of his Pamphlet, as well as here, he insinuates, that there are Many who are wanting in *Gratitude and Respect to their greatest Benefactor.* I wonder what Company it is that this Gentleman keeps, the *Remarker* meets with none such as are here described. He is for no *New sett of Principles*, but intends to adhere to the *Old Principles of the Church of Ireland.* And as for the *Clubs*, which are here mention'd; He solemnly declares that neither He, nor any of his Friends (that He knows of) were ever of any, but where there was always Honourable mention made of his late Majesty King *William*, and where a very particular regard was had to Her Majesty's Government, and the Protestant Succession as by Law Establish'd.

And now, what will the Reader think of Me for following the *Vindicator* thro' such a Maze of Impertinency? the *Letter-Writer* had drawn up a heavy Charge against the *Lower-Clergy*,

Clergy, and was called upon to prove it, and to tell how, and by whom, those abominable things were done. Instead of doing this, his *Vindicator* with *Abundance of Pains, Art, and Industry* draws a Monstrous Picture, and leaves it to the Reader to apply it at random to whom he pleases; and this he hopes to pass upon him for Argument. However I have fully examined into all his little Malicious Insinuations, and have plainly shewn them to be as False as they are Impertinent.

The *Vindicator* has a great many good and pious Sentences, which a Reader, less acquainted with him than I am, would imagine to flow from a deep Sense of Charity and Religion. He tells you, that the Gospel enjoyns Meekness, Forbearance, and Pref. Charity to all Men, but to those especially, who are under the highest Obligations of teaching those distinguishing Christian Virtues to Others. As for himself, he says, that if Others believe that He Pag. 22. has endeavoured to serve the Church, to do his Duty in his Profession, in promoting to the best of his Power the true Interest of the Religion Establish'd, He has not the least Concern at all what they think of his Eloquence. He compares himself to the best of Christians, who, he says, were drest in Bears Skins, shewn to the Mobb, and Pag. 35. thrown to the Lions. And, when He is charged with any Crime, and his own Words are produced against him, He crys out, that it is a most Uncharitable Construction, and Usurping the Pe- Pag. 15. culiar Prerogative of that God, who is the Searcher of all Hearts. Now would One expect that such a Man as this, who has Meekness, Charity, and Forbearance ready at hand upon all occasions, should so far lay aside the Practice of these distinguishing Christian Virtues, as to join in the Cry which has been falsely and maliciously raised against the Clergy, and be an Underworker to the Profess'd Enemies of their Order?

But to go on; the *Vindicator* is willing to bring this Point Pag. 27. to a short issue, as thus; If the Remarker or his Friends shall still say that all this is False, that no such Pains, &c. were taken. Let him and his Friends in the Lower House join in a Resolution to this effect, That it now is, and always was the Opinion and Judgment of the House, that the Bishops of the Upper House in England have not encroached on the Rights of the Lower Clergy there; nor done anything to enslave them, or make them a useless part of the Convocation.

Now the Mask is off; He represents the Dispute between the Two Houses in England to be, Whether their Lordships encroach upon the Rights of the Lower Clergy, and act so as to enslave them

them, and make them an useless part of the Convocation; as he invidiously terms it: And he would have the Lower House of Ireland come to a Resolution upon this Question. Now he may remember, that his Grand Complaint against the Two
Pag. 3. Members has hitherto been, that they had dragg'd the Convocation of Ireland into the Dispute between the Two Houses in England; The Two Members declar'd, they were so far from dragging the Convocation of Ireland into that Dispute, that what they had done was in their private Capacity, without pretending either the Knowledge, Consent, or Authority of the House to support them; For the Truth of this, they appealed to the Members themselves, who accordingly came to a Resolution in the Committee, That the Representation made by the Two Members to the Lower House of Convocation in England, was without the Knowledge, Consent, or Authority of the House; and that it did not appear, that the Two Members ever pretended to such Authority. And they came to a Resolution also, that the House had no way concerned it self in the Controversy between the Two Houses of Convocation in England.

Notwithstanding which, the *Vindicator* affirms over and over, that the House is engaged in that Dispute; nay, and that we are engaged on the Side of the Lower House, against the Bishops; and those who say otherwise he desires, in order to prove that they are not engaged, to join in a Resolution, which is not Practicable; and which if it were so, would infallibly involve them in that Dispute, which he desires to avoid.

The Resolution which he proposes is not Practicable, because the Opinion of the House can't be declared to have *always* been the same in this matter, as it may possibly appear to be now, should the Question be put. The Opinion of the House might have been different five or six years ago, from what it may be now, even tho' the House should be supposed to consist of the same individual Members now, as at the Beginning; and that without the imputation of Levity: For different Motives of Perswasion may appear now, from what appear'd formerly; and therefore what Opinion the House was of formerly, cannot be now known, since they did not then declare their Opinion. So that He must allow his Proposal to be impracticable, and the Question such, as would not admit either a Negative or an Affirmative to be given to it.

But

But were this Resolution Practicable, I say, it would necessarily involve us in the Dispute, which He represents to be attended with such frightfull Consequences. Let him take which side of the Question He pleases, and see whether this be not unavoidable. For if the *House* should Resolve one way, they would declare against the *Lower-House*: If the other way, against the *Upper*. And would not this effectually engage them in the Dispute?

And I doubt not but that this is really his Design notwithstanding all his plausible Pretensions to the Contrary. For nothing is more evident, than that Broils and Divisions are the chief things that He drives at, and that He has accordingly been labouring with all his Skill and Industry, to engage our *Two Houses* in Disputes with one another; But that not succeeding, he now endeavours to engage us on One side or Other of the Controversy in *England*, as is plain from the Nature of this his Proposal.

The Case in short stands thus; the *Vindicator* says, that the *Lower-House* of *Ireland* is engaged in the Controversy between the *Two-Houses* of *England*. The *Lower-House* denies that they are engaged in that Controversy at all. Yes, says the *Vindicator*, you are engaged, and I will not be convinc'd that you are not engag'd, unless you actually engage, and that will indeed be a Demonstration that you are not engaged.

And the same Spirit of Strife and Division which lately prompted him to endeavour, first to create a Quarrel between the *Two Houses* here, and (that not succeeding) then to involve us in the Dispute between the *Two Houses* in *England*, wrought in him formerly (in the Year 1704) with more Effect to engage us in a Dispute with the House of Commons. I suppose the *Vindicator* has not forgot the *Memorial* which the *Letter-Writer* drew up to be sent to that Honourable House, tho' I do not find that He has once mention'd That amongst the many Papers which He boasts to have drawn up for the Service of the *House*. With what Art it was that He prevailed upon the *House* to consent unwarily to, that Paper, the *Remarker* knows not, (for He was not that day in the *House*) but the warm Debates that it occasion'd in the *House* of Commons He well remembers: And He was as industrious in healing that Breach, as the *Letter-Writer* had been in making and enlarging it. And these Endeavours

Endeavours of the *Remarker* to prevent and compose Misunderstandings, the *Vindicator* calls the *Giving up the Rights of the House*: and the *Letter-Writer's* Endeavours to promote and encrease them, He calls *Standing up for the Honour of the Convocation*.

Preface.

The Paper which, He says, was drawn up by a Lay-Man, and which He insinuates the *Remarker* to be a *Forward and Zealous Man* to get to pass upon the House, as the only Terms of Reconciliation between the House of Commons and Them, was the Paper which was sent to withdraw the *Memorial*. By whom this Paper was drawn up, the *Remarker* knows not, but is well satisfy'd that it was not by any Lay-Man; for He is certain that it was communicated to the House by the *Prolocutor*. That He was Zealous to get this Paper pass the House, the *Remarker* freely owns, for He was desirous to have the Breach made up upon any terms that were Reasonable and Honourable: And He as freely owns, that the *Letter-Writer* was as Zealous in opposing it, being on the other hand as desirous to widen and inflame. But that this Paper, when it first came into the House, was an abject mean Compliance, or that it gave up any One single Right, or was in the least Derogatory to the Honour of the House, the *Remarker* denies: And he also denies, that it was the *Letter-Writer* who Altered and Corrected it into the Form in which it was afterwards presented to the Commons, so as to save the Honour of the sinking Convocation; as is here vainly Insinuated.

But had the Paper been as Slavish as the *Vindicator* would have it imagined, why must it be charged upon the *Remarker*? He was not the Man that either drew it up, or brought it into the House; nor was he more concern'd in it, then the rest of the Members; particularly it is well known, that Dr. Syngé went hand in hand with the *Remarker*, in every step of that Affair. And what ill Opinion soever the *Vindicator* may have of the *Remarker*, yet I hope he will not harbour any suspicion, that his Friend Dr. Syngé could be capable of doing any thing detrimental to the Rights and Privileges of the House.

The thing that grieved and still grieves the *Vindicator* is, that the Difference was so happily composed; that Those who were Enemies to Mischief and Division prevailed, and procured the same good Understanding between these Two Great Bodies, as there was before the *Memorial* had been presented; And this appears, as by several instances, so by the Resolution which

which that Honourable House came to immediately after.

Resolved, Nemine contradicente, *That this House will upon all Occasions Assert the just Rights and Privileges of the Lower-House of Convocation.*

They came also to the following Resolution.

Resolved, Nemine contradicente, *That this House will upon all Occasions, to the utmost of their Power, Support and Defend the Church of Ireland as by Law Established, against all Attempts and Practices against it whatsoever.*

As the *Vindicator* has hitherto been Vilifying the Convocation under a formal pretence of Vindicating them, so now he comes to use the *Colledge* after the same manner. It is worth the Reader's while to observe; first, the Motive that induces him to think that the *Colledge* has been Affronted, and then the Method that he has taken to do them Justice. The Author of *Partiality Detected* had taken Notice, that *Pag. 107*
a constant Correspondence had been held between Archdeacon Percivale in Ireland, and some who had been Members of the same *Pag. 42.*
Great Colledge with him in Oxford: To which the Remarker replied, that it was true, the Archdeacon did and does still hold a Correspondence with Many who have been Members of that truly *Pag. 38.*
Great Colledge. This, the *Vindicator* says, is to make free with the University of Dublin; that the Remarker should have remembered in what place he writ his Remarks; and not so invidiously have termed a Colledge truly Great, when he was almost in sight of a much Greater; and One that has not deserved from him to be so rudely and insolently treated. And in another place he says, *Pag. 39.*
That a certain truly Great Colledge, however Great or Good it may be, yet need not be complimented with an insinuation to render another truly Little.

Now the *Vindicator* in this very Work has call'd a Most Reverend Prelate, *A Great Man*; I own it is with a great deal *App. Intr.*
of Truth that he calls him so. But may not the Remarker, after the *Vindicator's* own way of Reasoning, infer that this is to make free with the rest of the Prelates; that the *Vindicator* should have consider'd in what place he writ; and not have term'd One Prelate Great, with an Insinuation to render Others Little; and such as have not deserved from him to be so rudely and insolently treated. Is not this, I say, the *Vindicator's* Argument? And would

would these Prelates thank any One for making such a Ridiculous and Odious Comparison?

Preface. Upon the best Inquiry that I can make, I have not met with one Member of that Famous University, who understood the words of the *Remarker* in that Sense, and with that Implication which is here given them. And the *Remarker*, tho' he is represented not to have even *Charity for any One, whose Principles, Judgment, or Notions in Politicks; Nay, whose very Education happens to be of a Society different from his*, yet is so happy as to have cultivated for many years, and still to maintain a Friendship, with many worthy Persons of this Society. And, since his being thus publickly accused by the *Vindicator*, They have unanimously done the *Remarker* the Honour to Admit and Incorporate him into their Body; a Favour which they would scarce have conferr'd upon him, if They had thought that He had treated them *Rudely and Insolently*, and had endeavoured to render them *truly Little*.

But how is it, that the *Vindicator* goes about to Defend the *Colledge* against the supposed Insults of the *Remarker*? Just the same way as he has Vindicated the *Convocation*; that is, by charging them with great Faults and Blemishes, and then by Publishing those imaginary Defects to the World.

Pag. 38. The *Youth* of the *Colledge* He represents to be Tainted with ill Principles, and the *Governours* to have little or no Authority over them. What else can he mean by telling the World of the *surprizing Success and Facility*, with which, he says, *some of the Younger Gentlemen of that Society have been Proselyted*, and how resolutely some have adhered to their new Opinions, and new Instructors? And of the little Influence the Principles or Examples of so many excellent Men, as are the present *Governours*, have had?

Pag. 39. And he Insinuates in the next Page, that the *Young Men* have a Contempt of the Society they belong to, and more especially of the Persons who must both Govern and Instruct them in it. And

Preface. elsewhere he says, that some Men have rendered Contemprible that Seat of Learning, which their Duty, Interest, and Honour, and the Oaths of many of them oblige to support and advance.

Now, if He is One of these Many whose Oaths oblige them to support and advance *this Seat of Learning*, He would do well to consider, whether this Method that He has taken is likely to Answer the Design of his Oath, or quite the Contrary. It is an old trick, much practis'd of late by the Enemies of the Church,

Church, to cry down the Universities upon all Occasions, to represent the *Members* to be of ill Principles, and the Discipline to be sunk and perish'd ; Such Accusations as these we meet with daily from some sort of People ; And is it not a surprising sight, for a Doctor of Divinity to chime in with them, and bespatter that Society, which has graced him with his Title ?

As for the *Remarker*, as He always had a great Respect and Honour for this Learned Society ; so now he has a greater than ever, since the *Vindicator* is pleased to tell Us, that the Youth have such Principles and Opinions, as He does not approve of. 'Tis a good Hearing ; and I heartily Congratulate the Society upon it. For I take it to be the greatest Compliment He can pass upon the Youth, to represent them as He does : As it would be the greatest Reproach, to have their Manners and Principles approved of by him.

It seems the *Vindicator* cannot asperse the *Remarker*, without aspersing at the same time many worthy Persons, with whose Reputation the *Remarker* is very willing his Own should be embarked. Thus it has been in this instance relating to the College ; His design is to render the *Remarker* Odious to that Body, but this He does after such a manner as to arraign the Youth for being of ill Principles, and the Governours for want of Discipline. And so it has been, in respect of the *Convocation* Affairs ; He would have the World think that the *Two Members* used Sinister Means, in procuring such Honourable Votes as the *House* passed upon them ; but in this there lay dormant a vile insinuation against the *House* it self. And so the *Members* understood it, as appears by the Resolution of the Committee ; That the *Asserting that this House was prevailed upon by Methods and Management, in their Proceedings relating to the Representation made by the Two Members, is a Scandalous Reflection on this House.* And so when He called the Account of the *Two Members* *Insincere* and *Partial*, after the *House* had Voted it to be a *Just* and *True* One : What was it but to charge the *House* it self with *Insincerity* and *Partiality* ? The Committee certainly was of this Opinion when they came to a Resolution, that the former part of this (the 16th) Paragraph doth highly reflect upon the Lower-House of Convocation, in declaring that to be a most *Insincere* and *Partial* Account, which they have voted to be a *Just* and *True* Representation of the Proceedings of the Lower-House of Convocation.

Pag. 34. The *Vindicator* tells us, that He is so far from thinking it a Reproach that a Man, under a fuller and clearer Conviction, should change his Opinion; that He reckons it the height of Pride, Malice, and Obstinacy to adhere to a false Opinion, only because a man had rashly taken it up, and persisted in it for some time before. I was glad to find, that He had hit upon such an Excellent Truth, even towards the end of his Book; and wish it had come into his Head at the Beginning. For if he had then squared his Practice according to it, it would have saved both Him and Me a great deal of Trouble.

But some People know more of their Duty, than they think fit to put in Practice. The *Vindicator* talks much of his having forgiven Injuries, and no doubt the Reader has observed many signal Instances of his having forgiven the Remarker in particular. The Colours in which He has Painted that Gentleman are very Bright and Shining, thro' every Page of his Charitable Pamphlet. The very first Sentence of it is, *If the Writer of the Remarks had not in his Title Page told us, that He is a Member of the Lower-House of Convocation, I should be inclinable to believe him of any Profession rather than a Minister of the Gospel.* And again, *How far the Remarker has kept up to the Rules of Christ's Gospel, in treating his supposed Adversary, is obvious to every Reader.* And in the first Paragraph of his Pamphlet, He says, that He earnestly prays God to forgive the Injury done to His Church by Practices so unbecoming one of it's Ministers. And that He does not envy him any Glory, that his Remarks are like to get him, by means so much below the Dignity of a Clergyman. And that this black Character of the Remarker may be sure of being seen, he has placed it in the first Pages of his Book; being, I suppose, conscious to himself that very few Readers would have the Patience to go much farther. The Remarker is also in the same Pages represented as a Tool to a Party, the *Persona Dramatis*, and that the True Design in Writing and Publishing the Remarks, was to prevent the supposed Letter-Writer from obtaining any Preferment, but that He has only shewn his Teeth. And yet He owns, that the Remarker has generally passed for a Man of good Humour, Civility, and Manners; And that He has known him for a Man of Civility, Temper, and Breeding. All which, I suppose, He says, not out of any Compliment to the Remarker, but to keep up his old distinguishing Character of Writing inconsistently.

Pref.
Pref.

S E C T. V.

Containing a True Account of the Proceedings of the Lower House, in relation to the Letter; with some Observations upon the False Account given by the Vindicator.

I Have been so long Dissecting this Lifeless *Vindication*, that I am afraid the Carcass begins to grow unsavory to the Reader; however, I beg his Patience whilst I lay open to his view that part of the *Work*, which the *Author* seems to think the Brightest and most Beautiful of the whole. And that is his *Appendix*; which he calls a full Narrative of the *Proceedings of the Lower House of Convocation, with Reference to the Letter*. The Reader is lead into this thro' a pompous *Introduction*, in which he is told, that this *Vindication* should have come out sooner, but that a most Reverend Prelate interposed and hindered it: Now, had the *Vindicator* paid such a Deference to the Judgment and Authority of that Great Man, as he pretends; I have reason to think that it would never have come out at all: For I am sure that that most Reverend Prelate, whom I am confident he here means and who labour'd very earnestly to prevent an Examination of the *Letter*, did at the same time express to several of the Members (whom I can name) the greatest Abhorrence, and Detestation of it.

The hard Resolutions, which he here complains of, the Reader I doubt not has found, by the foregoing Papers, not to have been so Hard as the *Letter* deserved: And by these that follow, he will see whether the *Vindicator* has a better hand at a Narrative, than his Friend has had at a *Letter*. They are so exactly of a Piece, that an impartial Judge can't but be divided within himself, which of the *Two* deserves the hardest Resolutions to pass upon it.

It was on May 20th, 1709. that Archdeacon Percivale complain'd to the House, that there was a Letter Published in a Pamphlet, Entitled Partiality Detected, relating to the Convocation of Ireland, which appear'd to him to be very Injurious and Prejudicial to the Rights and Privileges of the Convocation; With-
out

Appen. Rag. v. out any of those aggravating Terms of False, Scandalous, and Malicious, which, the Vindicator says, were then bestowed most plentifully upon it. The said Letter was read in the House, and a Select Committee was appointed to Examine and Consider it, with an Order to meet that Afternoon, and a Power to sit *de Die in Diem*, till they had finish'd; And that no Exceptions might lie against the Committee, as if it were composed of Partial or Prejudiced Persons, it was Order'd, that every Member that came should have a Vote.

The Committee met according to Order, and made choice of the Reverend Dr. Brown to be their Chair-man; Dr. Lambert moved pressingly against proceeding upon this Affair; he took notice, that many of the Members came prejudiced by some virulent Remarks which had been published against the Letter; and therefore he desired that they would put off the Consideration of it for a Fortnight, in which time He promised that there should be an Answer to the Remarks, and that every Paragraph of the Letter should be Justified. But he was told that the Committee was not to be guided either by the Remarks, or by any Answer that should come out to them; but by the Memory of the Members, and the Journal and Minutes of the House, which had been order'd to be laid before them, for this purpose. He then denied that they had Power to Examine or Censure any thing in Print; and when nothing would do, he flew out of the House in a very undecent manner, with Menaces, that it should come before Other Houses. Whereupon it was moved, that a Complaint should be made to the House of his insolent Behaviour; but it was passed by, at the Instance of Archdeacon Percivale and others, who imputed it to the great Discomposure and Disorder which he seem'd very visibly to lie under.

The Committee then proceeded to their Business, and having made some Progress, they adjourned to Saturday, May 21. at which time having met, and made some farther Progress, they adjourn'd to Monday, May 23.

On Sunday, May 22. His Grace the Archbishop of Dublin sent to several of the Members to come to him after Evening Prayer, Who waited upon him accordingly; and He was pleas'd to tell them, that the Convocations Proceeding on the Letter was Uneasy and Displeasing to His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant; And therefore he press'd very earnestly, that they would endeavour to adjourn the Committee for 3 Weeks. To which most of them were

were very averse, telling his Grace how False and Scandalous the *Letter* was, and how Injurious to the Rights and Privileges of the Convocation, which they thought themselves obliged to Vindicate and Assert; and that they could not conceive how the Censuring that *Anonymous Letter* could give any just cause of Offence to his Excellency. His Grace declared, that he had as bad an Opinion of the *Letter* as they could have; but that the Censuring of it, at this juncture, was not convenient, and therefore he hoped they would comply with his Desire, in adjourning the Committee. His Grace thus insisting very earnestly upon it, they promised to comply with an adjournment for Three Weeks; and the next day a Motion was accordingly made for an adjournment to *June 16.* which, after some Debate, was agreed to, upon Assurances given by those Members, that they did not intend to drop the Consideration of the *Letter*, but would proceed upon it again, as soon as the Adjournment was over.

In the Interim of the said Adjournment (*viz.* on *Wednesday, June 1.*) the House ordered that the Chairman should the next Session make a Report of the Resolutions of the Committee, as far as they had proceeded; which he accordingly did, *June the 3d*; but the House deferr'd the Consideration of the Report till the Committee should meet again and go through with the *Letter*.

On *Thursday, June 16.* the Committee met according to the adjournment; and having made some farther Progress, they adjourned to the next day, at which time they met and finished the Matter to them referr'd; and Order'd the Chairman to be ready to make his Report to the House the next Session, *viz. Jun. 20.* which he promis'd, yet he absented himself that day; and being ask'd by some of the Members, why he was not present to make his Report; He told them, that *indeed he was ready and fully resolved to have attended, but that his Grace the Archbishop of Dublin had sent for him; and had made use of his Excellencies Name, to prevail with him not to go to the House that day.*

The next Session (*June 23.* in the Afternoon) Dr. Brown appear'd in the House, and being called upon to make his Report, to the great surprize of all, he disown'd himself to be Chairman of the Committee; tho' a few weeks before (*viz. June 3.*) he had made a Report of their Resolutions, as far as the Committee had then proceeded. Dr. Lambert and his Friends

Friends, glad of any opportunity to *stave off* the Report, join'd Zealously with him, and kept the House for some time Debating, whether Dr. *Brown* was Chairman or not: And it appearing to the House, upon the unanimous Declaration of all the *Members* of the Committee, that he was Chairman; He was again called upon, as such, to make his Report; But it being by this time dark, he alledged that, since he could not be supposed to have the Report by Heart, it was impossible for him to make it in the Dark. Upon which Candles were order'd to be brought in, and, that Cause removed, he was again called upon to make the Report; and he then disown'd himself to be Chairman as before. But the House expressing a Resentment of such a Behaviour, and still insisting upon a Report, He declar'd that he lay under a *Disability* of making it; and being ask'd the Reason of such a Disability, he answer'd that he could not with safety to himself give the Reason, but humbly desired the Indulgence of the House in giving him time till the next Session; which was accordingly granted, but with a positive Command to attend and make his Report then; And then the House adjourn'd to *Saturday, June 25.*

The House being met according to the said adjournment, Dr. *Brown* was called upon to make his Report according to the Order of the day. But he declared to the House, that he could not make it; and offer'd in his Excuse, that about Ten of the Clock on *Monday Night* (*viz. June 20.*) he receiv'd a Letter from his Grace the Archbishop of *Dublin*, which he read in the House, to this effect; *That it was His Excellency the Lord Lieutenants Pleasure, that he should wait on His Excellency before he went to Convocation, and bring with him the Resolutions of the Committee.* That he had accordingly waited on his Excellency, and left with him the Resolutions of the Committee, and that this was the Reason that he was not able to make the Report.

Upon this the House, thinking it to be a matter of great Consequence, ordered the said Doctor to put into Writing what he had offer'd in his Excuse; which he said he would do in obedience to the House, and accordingly went to the Table, and spent some time there in Writing; But returning to his Place he declared that he was in such a Confusion, that he could not do it; and humbly desired that they would indulge him till the next Session, and then he would bring it in Writing. But the House insisting to have it then, and the Doctor persisting in his Refusal, they came to a Resolution,

That

That the whole Proceedings in this affair, relating to Dr. Brown's Behaviour, whose Two last Sessions (viz. June 23d and 25th) should be laid before the Upper-House, the next Synodical Meeting.

A Committee was accordingly appointed to draw up a Message, and was order'd to meet that Afternoon. And the Synodical Meeting being fixt for Monday, June 27th, between the Hours of Four and Five in the Afternoon; the House Adjourned to the same day, at three a Clock in the Afternoon, an Hour or Two short of the Synodical hour, on purpose that the Message from the Committee might be Reported and Agreed to by the House, against the time that the Upper-House should Sit.

The Committee had met according to Order, and had drawn up the Message relating to Dr. Brown's Behaviour, and the Chair-Man was now ready on Monday to make his Report. But the House Refused it, notwithstanding the Order that it should be taken into Consideration, and sent up to their Lordships the Bishops that Session. And Dr. Brown now acquainting the House that He was ready to make his Report, the Question was proposed and carried for Receiving it. The Report was accordingly Read, and a Debate happening upon the first Resolution of it, a Motion was made and carried for Recommitting the Letter.

And, since the *Vindicator* has given the Reader an imperfect Account of this Debate, and has represented it so as if the Argument had been entirely in the Letter-Writer's Favour, and that the Opposite side had not one Word to say, but sat down Ruffled and Confounded; I must beg leave to interrupt the Narrative, and give a true and impartial Account of that Affair. And in Order to this, I will lay down the Paragraph of the Letter, together with the Resolution which the Committee passed upon it. The words of the Letter are these: I must observe, that some time before the meeting of the Present Convocation in Ireland, Abundance of Pains, and Art, and Industry were used, to make many of the Clergy of that Kingdom apprehensive of dangerous Designs then forming against the Rights of the Church here; and particularly, that some of the Bishops of this Church were encroaching on the Rights and Privileges of the Lower Clergy: And designed either to enslave them or make them a useless part of the Convocation. It was necessary to tell you under what Fluency, nor by what an agreeable and pleasant manner, began to abate.

and consentently that the Clergy of Ireland under a strong Disposition to Support the Majesty of the Lower House here, and to Assume those for undoubted Rights and Privileges, which they saw so warmly claimed and defended by their Brethren here, and all under Pretence of Zeal for the Established Church.

The Resolution which the Committee passed upon this Paragraph was, as follows.

Resolved, that this Paragraph contains Matters that are False and Scandalous, highly reflecting on the Clergy of Ireland; and injurious to the Rights of the Lower House of Convocation.

Appen. When this Resolution was reported to the House, They of
Pag. ix. the Committee, save the Vindicator, were desired to assign the Falsity of it in any Particular; This they did not think fit to do, but urged that the Committee had come to that Resolution upon good Grounds, and that it lay on those who would defend the Paragraph to prove it. I own it was the Opinion of the Committee, that if any Writing should charge a Body of Men with ill practices, it would lie on the Authors of it to prove the Charge; Which if they should not be able to do, the Writing would then deserve to be look'd upon as False and Scandalous.

Appen. But Dr. Synge answer'd, that They had charged the Paragraph
Pag. x. with Falsity, that it lay upon Them to make good that Charge; For that every Writing, as well as every Man, is presumed to be Good and True, till the Contrary be made to appear. Now, in Answer to this reply, that indeed every Man is presumed to be Good and True, till the Contrary be made to appear: And for that very reason every Writing is not. For suppose a Writing should be published Representing some Men to be otherwise than Good and True, without so much as pretending to prove them so. What must we do in this Case? According to Dr. Synge's Argument, both the Men thus Represented, and the Writing so Representing them must be presumed to be Good and True, till the Contrary be made to appear: And is not this a manifest Contradiction? But now, since it is allow'd on both sides, that every Man is presumed to be Good and True till the Contrary be made to appear; it undeniably follows, that every Writing that Represents Them to be otherwise, without making it to appear, is Presumed to be False and Scandalous. And is not this exactly the Case before us? Has not this Paragraph Represented the Clergy of this Kingdom to be very Wicked, or at least very Weak? And has it in the least

(83)
least attempted to prove the Charge? Must we not therefore Presume the Clergy to be Good and True, since the Contrary has not been made to appear? And consequently the Paragraph to be False and Scandalous.

The Letter-Writer says, that Dr. Syngé went on and proved Appen. the Truth of every thing contain'd and asserted in that Paragraph. Pag. x. I believe this is much more than Dr. Syngé will venture to affirm, for he was so far from proving the Truth of every Assertion contain'd in that Paragraph, that he attempted to prove no more than this; That some Pains had been used to make some of the Clergy apprehensive that some of the Bishops of England were encroaching on the Rights of the Clergy. And the way he took to prove this was, by saying that he lived at Cork, where there were no Booksellers, and therefore he was forced to Correspond with a Bookseller in London, from whom he had some Pamphlets, in which he met with several insinuations against the Bishops: And that He and one Dr. Neal used to lend such Books to one another. This to the best of my Remembrance, and to the best of the Remembrance of several of the Members, whom I have consulted upon this occasion, was the whole of his Argument; Which certainly, if it proves any thing, proves only that He himself had used the Pains, Art, and Industry here spoken of. Let the Reader therefore judge with what Truth the Vindicator says, that the Doctor proved every thing contained in the Paragraph with so much Clearness, such Evidence of Facts, such convincing Arguments, and all of them so well known to the numerous Auditory, who were then Present; that the Gentlemen of the Opposite Side had not one word to return to him, but sat down Baffled and Confounded; only Mr. Percivale attempted, &c.

The great Concern which Dr. Syngé show'd in favour of the Letter-Writer, together with the great Heat and Passion, with which he expressed himself, was surprizing to all who had reason to expect a very different Behaviour from him. For he declar'd publickly in the House, that He could not blame Mr. Percivale for having made the Representation, and that, had He been at London in the same Circumstances, He believed that He should have done the same Thing. He declared moreover, that the Remarks was in his Opinion a full and solid Confutation of the Letter; except that in one point, (viz. that concerning the Provincial War) more might have been said than the Remarker had said up-

(84)

on it. He had also declared publicly how much he Abhor'd and Detested the Letter; and that he would, after the Adjournment to June 16th, as readily join in the Censure of it, as any Man; and he was as publicly put in mind of his having made such a Declaration.

But to go on; Upon Dr. Syng's undertaking to justify the Truth of every Proposition contain'd in the Paragraph, Mr. Percivale desired to know whether he would justify that part of it, which charged the Lower Clergy of Ireland with acting under Pretence of Zeal for the Establish'd Church. To this it was answered, that That did not relate to the Clergy of Ireland, but of England; Upon this Mr. Percivale took the Book in his Hand, and shew'd from the Context and from the plain Grammatical Construction of the Words, that it could refer to none but the Clergy of Ireland! For that it was the Clergy of Ireland who were Represented to Copy after the Majority in the Lower House in England, and to assume those for undoubted Rights and Privileges, which they saw so warmly claim'd and defended by their Brethren in England; immediately it follows, and All under Pretence of Zeal for the Establish'd Church! The All therefore that is said to have been done under a Pretence of Zeal, was the Copying and the Assuming. Since therefore it is acknowledged, that it was the Clergy of Ireland that were said to have Copied and to have Assumed, it must be They also who are said to have acted under a Pretence of Zeal.

And to this no other Answer was given, than what the Vindicator relates Dr. Syng to have offer'd; That he would take any Book (the Bible only excepted) and would oblige himself, in the way that Mr. Percivale treated that Paragraph, to force Heresy, Blasphemy and Nonsense, or any other Charge upon it.

There are two or three Affirmations concerning the Clergy of Ireland going before, and there is the Copulative And to Connect them with what follows, and therefore according to Dr. Syng's Exposition of the Words, the Sense of them must run thus; The Copying and Assuming of the Clergy of Ireland was all done by the Clergy of England, under Pretence of Zeal. Thus He must make Nonsense of the Words to avoid the Sense that they naturally bear, and in which the Committee took them.

But now, suppose these Words were capable of referring to the Clergy of England; Is it true then that the Lower Clergy of England all under a Pretence of Zeal only?

Most

Must we believe such a Scandalous Assertion of so Venerable a Body, and this without any the least Proof? For we have Nothing but the *Letter-Writer's* bare Word for it. And will not Dr. Syngé allow *Them* the benefit of his Noble Axiom, which he is willing to allow to every paltry Writing, that *They ought to be presumed Good and True; till the contrary be made to appear?* The Paragraph therefore must be own'd to be False and Scandalous, tho' we should allow the Clergy of *England*, and not the Clergy of *Ireland*, to be meant by it; Which is the utmost that the Doctor contended for.

As for the Methods which Mr. Dean *Ycard* represented were used in the Committee; True it is, that *some of Them came with Resolutions actually drawn*. And is any thing more common in Committees, either of Convocation or of Parliament, than for Members, who have well consider'd the Matter before them, to bring in Drafts of Bills or Resolutions to be offer'd to the Committee for their Consideration? This has been always thought a regular and proper Method for the dispatch of Business, and has been always practis'd in the Lower House of Convocation. But most of the Resolutions that were offer'd were so Just and Evident, that there was very little Occasion to debate about them; and to most of them Mr. Dean *Ycard* himself gave his Assent: Sometimes indeed he would offer an Amendment in the wording of them, as *Untruly* instead of *Falsely*, and such like.

The Merits of a Letter were never better Examined or more seriously Consider'd; and as for *Clapping of Hats on Dean Ycard's Mouth*, I am certain that no such Rudeness was ever offer'd; But as for the *Laughing* part, it must be own'd that there is something in it; *Quis tam Stoicus ut teneat se?* I believe there is not a Member of the House but has been often made merry with the Matter and Manner of Dean *Ycard's* Speeches.

But to proceed; The next Session, viz. *June 28.* in the Afternoon, We had an Affair before us of Consequence relating to the Observation of such Days as were particularly appointed by Act of Parliament to be kept Holy, which kept us till it was very late; And when that was over, and the House was grown very thin, many of the Members being gone, little expecting any other Business, Dr. *Brown* made a Motion, that *the Message to the Upper House relating to him might be dropt*: This was very much oppos'd as irregular, and against a Resolution which had been made for the Security of the Rights.

Rights and Privileges of the Convocation. We had formerly promised their Lordships to acquaint them with any Matter of Consequence that should happen amongst us, and we conceived that this of a Chairman's parting with the Resolutions of a Committee, of his own Head, so as not to have them ready to Report when called upon by the House, was of such a Nature, and did so much concern the whole Convocation, as that their Lordships ought to be made acquainted with it. And therefore it was insisted on, that the Resolution of the House should be observed; that so the House might not lose the advantage of their Lordships Advice and Assistance in an Affair that so nearly concern'd the Convocation. But nothing would do; a Question must be put to drop the Message; and so intent they were upon it, that they would not so much as suffer the House to be in possession of the Message, which they were going to drop, by admitting the Chairman of the Committee to Report it to them. In the heat of this Debate, a Motion was made for an Adjournment, which always used to take place; and is never Included in the General Rule, that *when a Motion is made and seconded, a Question ought to be put upon that Motion, before any new Matter can take place.* Notwithstanding which, they would not suffer the Intimation from the Upper House to be read, or so much as the Previous Question, whether the Motion for Adjournment should be put or no. The Question therefore for dropping the Message being put and carried, several Members Protested against it, and desired leave to enter their Protest in Writing the next Session; and then the House Adjourned to June 30.

At which time the several Members who had Protested the Session before, signed the following Protestation in the House, and desired it might be entred upon the Journals.

WE, whose Names are under-written, Members of the Lower-House of Convocation, do enter our PROTEST against a Resolution of this House on Tuesday the 28th Instant, concerning the Dropping of the Message relating to Dr. Brown's Behaviour, in the Words and for the Reasons following.

I. Because the House having order'd a Committee to draw up a Message to lay before their Lordships, relating to the Behaviour of Dr. Brown, &c. The Resolution to drop the said Message, being made before any Report of the Message was made from the Committee

ter, is Unparliamentary, and a Contradiction to the said former Resolution; and therefore no such Question could regularly be put.

H. Because the Motion to drop the said Message was made by Dr. Brown the Party Offending, and concerning whom the said Message was to be sent, and who ought not therefore to be admitted to Move, Debate, or Vote in his own Cause.

III. For that the Behaviour of Dr. Brown, (which was the Subject Matter of the said Message) viz. his giving up the Resolutions of a Committee to my Lord Lieutenant (in compliance with a Letter he receiv'd from His Grace the Archbishop of Dublin) was the highest Contempt and Disobedience to this House; was a Betraying, and, as much as in him lay, a Giving up the Rights and Privileges of this House: And the not proceeding to lay the said Behaviour before their Lordships, in order to have the same Censur'd, is, as We humbly conceive, a tacit Approbation of the said Dr. Brown's Behaviour, and consequently a Giving up the Rights and Privileges of this House; Which We apprehend to be a Betraying the Trust repos'd in Us as Members of the Convocation, and will highly Endanger the Safety and Constitution of the Church of Ireland.

IV. Because the House (as We conceive) proceeded irregularly, in refusing to put a Question upon a Motion made and seconded for an Adjournment, before the putting the Question for Dropping the Message.

Peter Drelincourt, Dean of Armagh.

John Leslie, Dean of Dromore.

John Francis, Dean of Leighlin.

John Clayton, Dean of Kildare.

John Wetenhal, Archdeacon of Cork.

Theod. Maurice, Archdeacon of Tuam.

Adam Usher, Archdeacon of Clonsfert.

Will. Percivale, Archdeacon of Cashel.

John Travers, Proc. for the Chap. of Christ Church,

Mossom Wye, Proc. for the Chap. of Rapho.

Patr. Moline, Proc. for the Chap. of Ardtert.

Tho. Leigh, Proc. for the Clergy of Dromore.

Hans Montgomery, Proc. for the Clergy of Down.

This

THis *Protest* thus signed by *Thirteen Members* was no sooner read in the House, but Dr. *Lambert* moved (and He was seconded by Dr. *Brown*) that it might be received, and entred into the Journals; And it was accordingly receiv'd and entred, by the Unanimous Vote of the House, One Negative excepted. And then the House Adjourn'd to July 28. the *Upper-House of Convocation*, as well as the Parliament, having Adjourn'd to that day.

The *Protest*, together with a *Memorial* or State of the Case, was soon Officially carried to his Excellency, who consulted the Queen's Council upon it; and They were pleased to give an Opinion (as I am informed, tho' I could never, with the utmost Industry I could use, get a sight of it) that the *Protestors* had acted in Derogation of Her Majesty's Prerogative, and might be Prosecuted for it, either by way of Information, or Inditement.

The *Protesting Members* were not conscious to themselves, of having done any thing that could in the least seem to derogate from her Majesty's Prerogative, for which they always had the greatest Respect, and Deference. They were assembled in *Convocation*, where Freedom of Debate is the Undoubted Right of every Member: And where every Member has also an Undoubted Right (practised in every *Convocation*, and never disputed in any) to enter his *Protest* in Writing against any Resolution of the House to which He gives a Dissent. And They think that such *Protests* may be entred, with as much Freedom and Security to the Members so *Protesting*, as if the same Matter had been offered by Word of Mouth.

And as for that part of this *Protest* which is supposed to have given Offence; Her Majesty's Prerogative was so little concern'd in it, that no Person was the Subject of any Assertion or Position therein but Dr. *Brown*; One of their own Members, and over whom there could be no Doubt, but that the House had a Power, and must be allowed to be the proper Judges, whether that Action of his, viz. *The giving up the Resolutions of a Committee to my Lord Lieutenant* (in compliance with a Letter he had received from his Grace the Archbishop of Dublin) was the highest Contempt and Disobedience to the House: was a Betraying, and, as much as in him lay, a Giving up of the Rights and Privileges of the House, or not. The Members of the House are, I say, undoubtedly the Judges of this; and may,

may, I hope, with Impunity affirm (as they shall see Cause) either side of the Question, and not become Obnoxious, even tho' they should happen to be mistaken in their Opinion.

The Chairman is allow'd to be a Servant of the Committee; He is intrusted with the Resolutions of it; and it is his Duty to Report them, when requir'd by the House. If therefore He refuses to obey the House, or puts himself under an Incapacity of doing it; May not any Member declare that in his Opinion he has thereby Betrayed, and as much as in him lies Given up the Rights and Privileges of the House.

If it be allowed (which I believe no Man will dispute) that the Chairman took upon himself singly to do that which He had no Power to do, and which ought regularly to be done by none but the House; then certainly He has so far intrenched upon the Rights and Privileges of the House, and the Protest will in that Point be found justifiable.

As for their saying, that the not Proceeding to lay the said Behaviour before their Lordships, in order to have the same censured, is (as they humbly conceive) a Tacit Approbation of the said Dr. Brown's Behaviour, and consequently a Giving up the Rights and Privileges of the House, which they apprehend to be a Betraying the Trust reposed in them, as Members of the Convocation, and will highly endanger the Safety and Constitution of the Church of Ireland: Now, suppose they were mistaken in what they have here humbly conceived, is it Criminal to be Mistaken in a Point of this Nature?

That which they apprehend to be a Betraying the Trust reposed in them, and which, they say, would highly endanger the Safety and Constitution of the Church of Ireland, is the Giving up the Rights and Privileges of the Lower-House of Convocation. This is an Opinion which they frame upon the Premises, and which might easily be deduced out of them. For if the Convocation be (as it is acknowledg'd to be) an Essential part of the Constitution of the Church, then certainly the Betraying the Rights and Privileges of that Essential Part, will be to endanger the Safety and Constitution of the Church. For where an Essential part of any Body Natural or Politick is Broken and Betray'd, the Safety and Constitution of the whole Body will be in danger.

These things being so clear, it is amazing to me to find Dr. Lenthall, and those few Others (who signed an humble Petition to their Lordships the Bishops against this

Protest) asserting, that they conceived the Reverend Protestors to have made a very Dangerous Encroachment upon Her Majesty's Supremacy in Causes Ecclesiastical. Had the Protestors inadvertently expressed themselves so as might have given their Enemies an Handle to Warp and Wire-draw their Words to their Disadvantage; yet, they little expected, that any of the Sons of Levi would have employed themselves in such an Odious Undertaking. They little thought that Clergymen (who do not pretend any Danger to themselves from it) would have labour'd to render their Brethren Obnoxious to the Government, for having acted in Convocation with that Honesty, Openness, and Sincerity that became them.

I know these Gentlemen will plead their Zeal for Her Majesty's Prerogative; And God forbid that any of us should Harbour the least thoughts of Acting in Derogation of it. No, it is well known, that none are more Zealous in Asserting and Maintaining the Queen's Prerogative and Supremacy in Causes Ecclesiastical, than these very Members who are here accused by their Brethren for having Encroach'd upon it; And they think that such a Liberty and Freedom of Debate, as they used in Convocation, is very Consistent with it.

The Queen's Council learned in the Law had, 'tis likely, just Reason to give such an Opinion as they did upon the Case, as it was stated to them. The *Memorial* laid before them (and which none of the Protestors could ever prevail to get a sight of) was no doubt drawn up by the *Honest Letter-Writer*, and as He had with his usual Sincerity stated the Case, it might probably have deserved as Severe an Opinion as it is said was given upon it.

The *Protesting Members* were not a little Alarm'd at what had happen'd, and how well satisfy'd soever they were of their own Innocency, yet they thought it Prudent to take the best Advice that could be got upon this Occasion; and therefore they applied themselves to some very Eminent Lawyers, and laid a true State of their Case before them; Who were of Opinion, and gave it under their Hands, that the Matter of the *Protest* contain'd nothing at all that was Criminal in it, or in the least Derogatory to Her Majesty's Prerogative. But that, if there had been any thing Criminal in it, since the House had admitted it upon their Journals, the whole House and not the Protestors only would be Chargeable with it.

It has been already said, that the *Two Houses* had Adjourn'd themselves from *June 30*, to *July 28*. In the Interval of which Adjournment his Excellency was pleased to make the following Order of Reference, which was delivered to His Grace my Lord Primate by the Hands of Dr. Lambert.

THE Annexed Memorial and Protest of some Members of the Lower-House of Convocation in Dublin, are hereby referred to the Lord Primate, and Lord Archbishop of Dublin, taking to their Assistance such of the Bishops as they shall think proper, who are desired to give their Opinion thereupon.

T. Wharton.

In pursuance of this Order, the Lord Primate and the Archbishop of Dublin, on *July 12*, called to their Assistance the Bishops of *Kildare*, *Clogher*, and *Down*. But it being urged that the matter refer'd was of very great Moment, and that it was reasonable that the other Bishops in Town should likewise be consulted, the Consideration of it was put off till the next day, when all the Bishops that were in Town were summon'd, and at that Meeting the following Answer was returned to the said Reference.

May it please your Excellency,

IN Obedience to your Excellency's Order of Reference to us directed, We have called to our Assistance the Lord Archbishop of Tuam, the Lords Bishops of Meath, Kildare, Clonsfert, Killal-la, and Clogher: And as to the Protest of the Thirteen Members of the Lower House of Convocation Referr'd to Us, together with the Memorial Annexed; the Lords Bishops, whom We have called to our Assistance, do conceive that the Matter being Transacted in the Lower-House of Convocation during the Session, they can't give any Opinion of what was done there during the Recess. And We humbly intreat your Excellency to excuse Us from giving any Opinion without their Concurrence.

Narcissus Armagh.
Will. Dublin.

This Answer was no sooner Reported to His Excellency by the Lord Primate and the Archbishop of Dublin, but Dr. Lambert came immediately to my Lord Primate, and in his Excellency's name demanded back the said Papers.

The Convocation being met on July 28. according to the Adjournment, there was a much greater Appearance than had been any time during the whole Session before. And then the Lower-House thought fit to take into their Consideration the Case of the *Protesting Members*, and ordered the *Protest*, together with the whole Proceedings relating thereto, to be laid before their Lordships of the Upper-House the next Session. And the following Message was accordingly laid before their Lordships. July 29.

May it please Your Graces and Lordships,

W Hereas some Members of the Lower-House of Convocation Protested last Sessions against a Resolution of the House, in order (as They conceived) to preserve the Rights and Privileges of the Convocation; which Protestation being in the Opinion of this House Regular, and what They had an Undoubted Right to make, and as such, was enter'd on the Journals by the Unanimous Consent of the House, (One Negative excepted.) And whereas the said Protesting Members have since been much Reflected on, and Endeavours have been used to Terrifie them by the Opinion of some Lawyers, as if They had done something highly Criminal; We therefore out of a tender Regard to our said Members, and for the better Security of our Rights and Privileges, humbly crave Leave to lay the said Protestation, together with the Proceedings relating thereto, before Your Graces and Lordships, not doubting of Your Paternal Care and Protection of Us.

Upon a Complaint made in the Lower-House of Convocation on Friday, May the 20th, 1709, of a Letter Printed in a Pamphlet, Entituled *Partiality Detected*, Relating to the Convocation of Ireland, That it was very Prejudicial to the Rights and Privileges of the Convocation; The said Letter was Read in the House, and a Committee was appointed to Examine it, with an Order to meet that Afternoon, and a Power to Sit *de die in diem*, as They should think fit, till They had finished.

The Committee accordingly met, and made Choice of the Reverend Dr. Brown to be their Chairman; which Place he accordingly took, and then they proceeded to consider the said Letter, and by several Adjournments went through the same Paragraph by Paragraph, and

and came to several Resolutions, and having finished the Matter to Them referr'd on Friday, June the 17th, They Ordered the Chairman to attend the House, and to be ready with his Report the next Sessions being Monday, June the 20th, which he promised, yet absented himself from the House that Session.

The next Session being Thursday, June the 23d, in the Afternoon, He appeared in the House, and being call'd upon to make the Report, he disown'd himself then to be Chairman of the said Committee, and kept the House for some Time debating whether he was Chairman or no; but it appearing to the House, that he was Chairman, he was call'd upon as Such to make his Report; It being by this time dark, he said it was impossible for him then to make his Report, for that it was dark, and that he could not be supposed to have it by-heart: Upon this Candles were Ordered to be brought in, and then being again call'd on, as Chairman, to make his Report, he disown'd himself to be Chairman, as before; But after another long Debate, it being Determin'd that he was Chairman, he declared, he lay under a Disability of making the Report; And being ask'd the Reason of it, he said that he could not with Safety to himself give the Reason; but humbly desired the Indulgence of the House in giving him time to the next Session, which was granted him, but with a Positive Command to attend and make his Report then, and then the House Adjourn'd to Saturday, June the 25th.

The House being met according to the said Adjournment, Dr. Brown was call'd upon to make his Report according to the Order of the Day; But he told the House he could not make it, and offered in his Excuse, that about Ten of the Clock on Monday Night, viz. June the 20th, he received a Letter from His Grace the Lord Archbishop of Dublin, (which he read in the House) to this effect, That it was His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant's Pleasure, that he should wait on His Excellency before he went to Convocation, and bring with him the Resolutions of the Committee appointed to consider of a Letter, &c. That he had accordingly waited on His Excellency, and left with Him the Resolutions of the said Committee, and the Book, in which the said Letter was Printed and Paragraph'd, and that His Excellency was for having the whole Matter dropt; but that He would do nothing in relation to the Church, without consulting the Bishops, and particularly the Archbishop of Dublin; and that he should in a short time hear from Him by His Grace the Archbishop of Dublin.

By these means the House could not have the Report for Three Sessions successively.

Upon

Upon this, the House Ordered the said Dr. Brown to put into Writing, what he had now delivered by word of Mouth, which he said he would do in Obedience to the House, and accordingly went to the Table, and having spent some time there in Writing, he return'd to his Place, and declared, he was under such Confusion, that he could not put in Writing, what he had just then Delivered *vis a voce*: And made it his Humble Request to the House, that they would indulge him till the next Session for putting it in Writing; and the Question being put for such Indulgence, it pass'd in the Negative. Notwithstanding which he persisting in his Refusal, the House came to a Resolution, That the whole Proceedings in this Affair, relating to the said Dr. Brown's Behaviour these Two last Sessions, (*viz.* June the 23d, and 25th,) should be laid before the Upper-House the next Synodical Meeting. Which was fixed for Monday, June the 27th, between the Hours of Four and Five in the Afternoon. And a Committee was accordingly appointed to draw up a Message relating to the Behaviour of Dr. Brown, and Ordered to Sit at Five that Afternoon; And then the House adjourn'd to Monday at Three of the Clock in the Afternoon, being an Hour or Two before the Synodical Hour, on purpose that the Message from the Committee might be Reported and Agreed to by the House, against the Time that the Upper-House should meet.

The Committee met according to the said Order, and drew up the Message, and the Chairman was accordingly ready to make a Report next Session; the Reverend Dr. Brown telling the House, that he was ready to make his Report, the House read it, and re-committed the Letter; And so the Report was refused to be received, tho' the said Message was ordered to be the first thing taken into Consideration that Session.

The next Session, *viz.* June the 28th, in the Afternoon, Dr. Brown mov'd, that the Message relating to him should be drop'd, and tho' the Motion was very much Oppos'd, as being Irregular, and against a Resolution for Security of the Privileges of the House; (the Intent of the Message being to assert and preserve the Rights and Privileges of the House) yet the Question was put on the said Dr. Brown's said Motion, and pass'd in the Affirmative; against which Resolution Thirteen Members made the following Protest, which by Order of the House was enter'd on the Journals.

For which Protest the Reader is referr'd to Pag. 86, 87.

The House having consider'd this *Message* Paragraph by Paragraph, and order'd it to be laid before their Lordships as has been said; The Committee to whom the *Letter* had been Recommitted, was then order'd to Sit at nine of the Clock the next Morning. They met accordingly on July 29, and having chosen Archdeacon *Maurice* Chairman, in the room of Dr. *Brown* who was then out of the Kingdom, went thro' the *Letter* Paragraph by Paragraph, tho' not at *One Sitting* as the *Appen. Vindicator* relates. The several Resolutions, which they came to upon it, I need not give the Reader here, because in the foregoing Papers he will find them all disperfed in their proper Places. The Number of the *Members* were now mightily encreas'd with *New Auxiliaries* (as the *Vindicator* is pleas'd to call them) from the Country; For all *Members* were Summon'd to Attend under pain of Contumacy, tho' not upon the *Weighty Debate of the Letter*, as the *Vindicator* tells us. *Intr.* For the Order of Summons was from the *Upper-House* where, as yet, no Mention had been made of the *Letter*. But their Lordships, having some time before recommended Business of great Importance to the *Lower-House*, were pleas'd in Compliance with an Application from them to require the Attendance of all the *Members*. It is therefore a peculiar Freedom which the *Vindicator* takes with their Lordships in Representing them to have summon'd all the *Members* to Town, purely to Debate about his *Letter*; which were it true would however imply, what the *Vindicator* does not much care to own, that there was something in his *Letter* of such Consequence to the *Convocation*, as, in their Lordships Opinion, to deserve the Attendance of all the *Members*.

After his taking such Freedom with their Lordships, I don't wonder that he makes bold with his Brethren, in saying that *Most of those Members* (who came up in Obedience to the Summons) came up with *Strange Prepossessions* against the *Letter*, and with *Minds strongly disposed to Censure and Condemn it*. *Appen. p. xviii.* Their great Zeal, if they shew'd any, proceeded from their being fully convinc'd of the many Misrepresentations and evil Tendencies, which they observed in the *Letter*; of which a few Copies were Printed on purpose, and put into the Hands of the *Members*, that they might be the better able to Judge of it. Besides the Committee could not be supposed to consist of Partial or Prejudiced Persons, for every Member that came was permitted to have a Vote, so that in Effect it was the

the whole House. One would think that the *Letter-Writer*, had He been innocent, could not have wish'd for a fairer Tryal, than to have such great Numbers of his Brethren to come from all parts of the Kingdom to examine into the Merits of his Letter.

Pref. How hard is it to please this Gentleman? He once complain'd of his being mightily injured by a *thin* House, and sure He was, that a *fuller* House would have done him Justice: But now his great Grievance is, that He has got a *full* House; Is not this something of the *Spleenitick* kind, as the *Vindicator* calls it?

Pag. 3. On *August 5.* A Report was made of the Resolutions of the Committee in a very *full* House, tho' Dr. *Lambert* and Dr. *Synge*, and some few others did what in them lay to hinder the House from taking them into their Consideration. Dr. *Lambert* insisted upon his Old Plea, that the House had no Right to Censure any thing in Print; and He produced a Catalogue of Pamphlets Relating to the Convocation of England (Printed at the end of the *Proceedings of the Convocation, A. D. 1705*) in not one of which (said he) is there any one Instance so be given of a Censure passed by the Lower-House of Convocation in England upon any thing in Print. Upon which a Member stood up, and shew'd him out of that very Book (which the Doctor had in his hand) a Remarkable Instance of a Censure unanimously passed by the Lower-House in England, upon just such another Libel as was now before Us, viz. That the Pamphlet (there mentioned) doth contain a very Disingenuous, Partial, False, and Scandalous Account of the Proceedings of this Present Convocation; That several Considerable Matters of Fact therein represented are directly contrary to the Truth, as it is attested by the Acts of this House; And that in the Relation of the Debates there pretended to be given, are divers Material Additions, Omissions, and Variations highly injurious to the Honour of this House, and Manifestly tending to the great Damage and Defamation of many of its Members.

And this Resolution He said was so exactly suited in every part of it to the Affair in Hand, that, had he seen it sooner, he would have moved for having the self-same Resolution pass upon the Letter. And upon this the Doctor to the great surprise of the House sat down and said nothing.

And Dr. *Synge* (who was now become a strenuous Advocate for the *Letter-Writer*) denied as roundly as He, that the House had

had Power to Censure any thing in Print; But it unluckily appear'd upon the Journal, that He himself had brought in formerly a *Printed Pamphlet* to be Censured, and that it was accordingly Censured by the House.

But all that these Two Gentlemen could say (which indeed was very little) could not induce the House to lay aside the Consideration of this Report; The two first Resolutions of which were agreed to by a very great Majority (42 against 13) and I may be bold to say, that as good Reasons would have appear'd to induce the House to agree to the rest, if they had not been Interrupted by a Prorogation, which the *Letter-Writer* well knew was to take place that day. And therefore He and Dr. *Synge* did what they could to spin out the time with long Speeches, without much regarding whether they were to the purpose or not; Particularly Dr. *Synge* brought with him a large Bundle of Pamphlets, as many I suppose as he had received from his Correspondent Bookseller in *London*, or had borrowed from his Friend in *Cork*; All written in *England*, and all relating to what had happen'd in *England*, to prove the Truth of the *Letter-Writer's* Assertion, that *Abundance of Pains, Art, and Industry had been used in Ireland*.

Dr. *Synge* may remember that when he used this Argument before, he was desired by a Member to speak to the Point, and not to meddle with the Affairs of the *Convocation of England*, but to confine himself to what related to us here. This (as that Member assures me) was done, that the Dispute between the Two Houses in *England* might not be brought into Debate here; and yet, upon this necessary Caution given, the Doctor was so offended, that He complain'd heavily of his being interrupted. And therefore the House was resolved now to give him no Interruption, but to let him go on with his Pamphlets; and on he went for near an hour and on he would have gone no doubt for an hour longer, if the Writ of Prorogation had not Interrupted him. And the House would then have known just as much of the *Abundance of Pains, Art, and Industry* used in *Ireland*, as they knew before.

Now, had Dr. *Synge* proved the utmost that was possible to be proved out of those Pamphlets, viz. That Endeavours had been used in *England* to make it thought, that the *Bishops were encroaching upon the Rights and Privileges of the Lower Clergy*;

yet how would it follow from thence that *Abundance of Paint, Art, and Industry had been used to the same purpose in Ireland?* And if he himself had ever been induced to harbour such thoughts of the Bishops of *England* (as he own'd he once did) yet how does it follow, that *Many of the Clergy here did so readily entertain this Notion?* Or if *Many* had entertain'd this Notion, how does it follow that consequently the *Lower Clergy were under a strong Disposition to Copy after the Majority of the Lower House in England, and to Assume* (as if they had no Right, and only Usurp'd) *those for Undoubted Rights, which they saw so warmly claim'd and defended by their Brethren in England?* Or if they did thus Copy and Assume, yet still how will the foulest and blackest Imputation follow that *They did All under a Presence of Zeal for the Establish'd Church?*

Had Dr. Synge and the Letter-Writer confin'd their Assertions to themselves only, no One would have been at the Pains to Contradict them, for they may make as free with their own single Persons as they please; But when they say, that *Many*; and not only so, but that the *Lower Clergy of Ireland were Guilty of these Practices*; And with the aggravating Circumstance of having done all *under an Hypocritical Pretence of Zeal for the Church*; Certainly an Impartial Reader will easily see, that there was just Cause for the House to agree with their Committee in the Resolution, that *the Paragraph contains Matters that are False and Scandalous, highly Reflecting on the Clergy of Ireland, and Injurious to the Rights of the Lower House of Convocation.*

As soon as the Upper House met, July 28. according to their Adjournment, their Lordships desired my Lord Primate to lay before them the *Protest* of the Thirteen Members, the *Order of Reference*, and the *Memorial*, which he had received from his Excellency during the Recess. But His Grace acquainting their Lordships, that Dr. Lambert had been with him, and had in the Name of His Excellency Remanded all back from him; They thought fit to appoint the Lord Primate and the Lord Archbishop of *Tuam* to wait upon His Excellency, and humbly to desire Him to lay before the Upper House of Convocation the *Protest* of the Thirteen Members of the Lower House; the Opinion of the Queen's Council thereon; the Reference he was pleased to make to the Lord Primate and the Archbishop of *Dublin*; and their Report upon it.

it. The two said Prelates waited upon His Excellency accordingly; and his Excellency assured them, that He had none of those Papers by him, having immediately sent them away for *England*, and laid them before the Queen; And this He said was no Excuse but a certain Truth.

This being Reported to their Lordships, I find on the Journals of the Upper-House, that their Lordships on *August 5.* came to the following Resolution, viz. *That whereas it appears by my Lord Lieutenants Answer to a Message from this House sent by His Grace the Lord Primate and the Archbishop of Tuam, July, 28. 1709, humbly praying His Excellency, that He would be pleased to lay before this House His Excellencies Order of Reference to the Lord Primate and the Archbishop of Dublin, with the annex Memorials, and the Protest of some Members of the Lower House of Convocation, together with the Queen's Council's Opinions thereupon, delivered to His Grace the Primate by Dr. Ralph Lambert (as he alledged) by His Excellencies Command, July 11. 1709. All which Papers were immediately Remanded by the said Doctor; That the aforementioned Papers have been sent to the Right Honourable the Earl of Sunderland, in order to be laid before Her Majesty; whereby we fear several Members of Convocation (of whom we are very tender) may be exposed to Danger, and the Rights and Privileges of Convocation concern'd; That an Agent or Agents be employed by this House to go forthwith into England, to pray a View of the said Papers, and to lay the whole Proceedings of Convocation in this Matter in a due and proper Light before Her Majesty.*

And the House did then appoint the Lord Bishop of *Ossory*, and the Lord Bishop of *Killaloe* to go forthwith into *England* accordingly.

And then His Grace my Lord Primate Introduced the Queen's Writ, which being received and read, the Two Houses were Prorogued to *Tuesday the 4th of October next.*

IT may now be expected, that I take some Notice of what Dr. Lambert and a few others have objected against the Protest of the Thirteen Members, in their Humble Petition to my Lords the Bishops.

Their Objection against the first Reason is, *Because, as they Appen- say, It is a received Maxim, that the House is Master of its p. xv. own Orders; as long as they continue in the Possession of the House. By Orders here they must mean Resolutions, or else they do not speak pertinently to the Point. But now I must*

tell these Gentlemen, that there are a great many things, which a Man or a Body of Men are Master of, and may do strictly speaking, that is, they are restrained by no positive Law from doing them; And yet they cannot do them with Wisdom, Prudence, or Discretion. A Man may change his Opinion with the Wind, and his Resolution with the Tide; he may detest a *Letter* one day, and plead its Cause another; for what should hinder him? Is he not Master of his own Resolution and Opinion? But in the mean time, does it consist with the Wisdom, or Honour of a Venerable Body of Men to Resolve one day, and break that Resolution the next? And ought not every Member to oppose Those who endeavour to render the Resolutions of their Body thus Cheap and Contemptible? Or, if he should be over-power'd by Numbers, to shew his dislike of their Proceedings, by Protesting against them?

Appen.
p. xvi.

They do not deny, but that such a Proceeding is *Unparliamentary*; But they say, *We are not Proper Judges of what is Parliamentary, or what not.* Now suppose we should tell a Man that what he is doing is against Law; might he not reply? Gentlemen, *You are not Proper Judges of what is Law, and what is not.* And in this he would say very truly; For there are certain Persons vested with Publick Authority, who are really and truly the *Proper Judges* of what is *Law*, and what is not. And yet we may with great Truth determine some certain Actions to be against *Law*, and for that Reason refuse to join in them, and Declare and Protest against them. And thus in the Case before us, tho' there be Others who are really and truly the *Proper Judges* of what is *Parliamentary*, and what is not; yet we may with great Truth determine some Actions to be *Unparliamentary*, and for that reason refuse to join in them in Convocation, and Declare and Protest against them. But *they dont think the House to be tyed up by the Rules and Methods of Parliamentary Proceedings*; So it seems by their Acting; But I hope they will allow Others to think that a *Parliamentary Body*, such as the Convocation in some measure is, ought to be tyed up by those Rules and Methods, which Reason Wisdom and long Experience prescribe as proper and necessary for such a Body; and such I take the Rules and Methods of Parliamentary Proceedings to be. But amongst the Objections that these Gentlemen have brought against the word *Unparliamentary*, I wonder that they have omitted One, as strong as any they have here urged; which

Ibid.

Dr.

Dr. Synge, One of their Number, mentioned in the House; and that is, that it was a *Long Word*; And some could not forbear smiling to see him shew such an Aversion to *Long Words*, and yet such a Fondness for *Long Speeches*.

Their Objection against the Second Reason of the *Protestors*, is much of a peice with that which they brought against the First; For they are of Opinion that the Party offending ought to be admitted to *Move, Debate, and Vote in his own Cause*, being Resolved to be tyed up by no Rules or Methods of Parliamentary Proceedings. But the *Protestors* are desirous to have their Body tyed up by those Rules, where the same Reason holds to have them observed in their Body, as in the Parliament it self.

Their Objection against the Third, is, That it was not in *Ibid.* Compliance with His Grace the Archbishop of Dublin's Letter, that Dr. Brown gave up the Resolutions of the Committee to His Excellency. Did not His Grace's Letter direct him to go to his Excellency, and to bring the Resolutions with him? And did not the Doctor say, that he went accordingly and left the Resolutions with his Excellency? It is plain therefore that the Doctor took his Grace's Words to imply as much.

But, that it does not any way appear to be true in Fact, that *Ibid.* the Doctor gave up the Resolutions of the Committee, but altogether the contrary, is very surprizing. That he gave them up, he told us in the House as plainly as words could express it; He said moreover, that this was the Reason why he could not make a Report. Nay the *Vindicator* himself (one of the Subscribers to this Petition) acknowledges in his Narrative, that when the Chairman was called upon for the Report, *Appen. P. viii,* It was impossible for him to make it, the Report being at that time out of his Hands and out of his Power. And so intirely had he given up the Resolutions, that I can prove that he never had them so much as returned to him again, at least not at the time that he made his Report. For He made it from a Copy of the Resolutions that had been taken by a Member of the Committee; which Copy he procured on Sunday June 26. five or six days after He had parted with the Original, as is very particularly known to another of the Subscribers. And this is evident from a Note, which that Member from whom they were procured had made for his own use, which
very

Appen.
p. xvii.

very Note was Transcribed into the Copy, which Dr. Brown made use of, when he made his Report. And Dr. Brown himself told it to several afterwards, that it was a Copy which he had made use of, and that he had never got the Original from his Excellency. And therefore all that the said Dr. Brown appears to have done, is not only the laying the Resolutions before His Excellency (which yet he had no Authority to do without leave, being at that time a Servant of the House) and acquainting the House with His Excellency's Thoughts and Opinion of the same. And as for the very dangerous Encroachment, which, they say, the Protestors have made upon Her Majesty's Supremacy in Causes Ecclesiastical; I have already shewn, that they have made no Encroachment at all, and that they abhor the very thoughts of it. However 'tis a Good-Natured Charge upon their Brethren, and worthy of the Persons that make it.

Ibid.

Their Objection against the Fourth Reason is, *Because it is a Rule of the House, that when a Motion is made and seconded, the Question shall by the Prolocutor be put upon the said Motion before any New Motion be admitted to be made.* Therefore they Argue that the Motion for an Adjournment was irregular, as being own'd to be a New Motion, tho' it brings not any New Matter into Debate. But, if this standing Order be not before any New Motion be admitted to be made; But before any New Matter be admitted into Debate; What will then become of their Argument? And if the Reader will but look over the Books, he will find that the Petitioners have misrepresented this Order to serve a Turn, and have flyly inserted the Word *Motion* instead of the Word *Matter*.

And as for the *Motions* being made upon a Synodical Day; I own it could not regularly be made, if the Upper House had continued sitting; because then We must have waited to have an Intimation of the Day to which the Upper House had Adjourn'd: But the Petitioners know that the Upper-House had Adjourn'd before this Motion for Adjournment was made in the Lower-House, and that their Adjournment had been intimated by their Actuary; so that there could be no manner of Objection from thence against this Motion for an Adjournment. And therefore I can see no other Reason for their Rejecting it, but their being Resolved, as in the rest, so in this

to be tyed up by no Rules and Methods of Parliamentary Proceedings.

And whereas the Petitioners say, that at the same time that Appen. they gave their Consent that the Protest should be entred upon the p. xiv. Journals, They declared that they did altogether disapprove of the Matter of it; It is well known to be quite otherwise. Dr. Lamberts moved to have it receiv'd into the Journal; and it was agreed to be so receiv'd, before any One of the Petitioners declared against the Matter of it. But I own that immediately after, Dr. Synge mov'd that this very Paper, which he had just before voted upon the Journal, should now be taken into Consideration. He was shew'd the Absurdity of such a Motion; that he might as well bring back into Debate every thing else that stands upon the Journal as this, that the proper time of Debating it was when the Protest had been read in the House, that then the House was in possession of it, and could not be presumed to admit it into the Journal, if it had contain'd any thing Exceptionable either as to the Matter, or Form of it. But He still insisted with great Warmth that his Reasons against it might be entred as well as the Protest, least he should be thought to approve of it. He was told that He was in no danger of having it mistaken for his Protest, since his Name was not subscribed to it: But that it was unavoidable for him not to be thought so far to approve of it, as to have seen nothing in it that was illegal or unfit to be inserted into the Journal, since He gave his Vote to have it inserted. That if his Reasons should be admitted upon the Journal, They would be a Protest against this Protest; And might not the *Protesting Members* claim the same Right to have their Reasons admitted against his Reasons? Which would be a Protest against his Protest against their Protest, and then He might enter another Protest, and so on in infinitum.

These Absurdities which would necessary have followed from his Motion, had it taken Place, easily induced the House to reject it. For tho' every Member has a Right to enter his Protest against any Resolution to which he gives a Dissent, yet the same Reason does not hold for a Member's entering his Dissent to such a Protest. For the whole House being included by the Vote of the Majority, it will not appear but that every particular Member join'd with that Majority, unless those who differ enter their Protest: But no Member will be thought to have join'd with those *Protesting Members* (tho' his Dissent be

be not entred against their *Protest*) if his Name does not appear amongst them. But tho' every *Member* has a Right thus to *Protest* against any Resolution of the House to which He Dissents, yet He has not a Right to enter his *Protest* after what Manner and in what Words He pleases; For He may offer it in such Terms as the House will not think proper to lodge upon their Books. As for instance, should the Words of his *Protest* contain any thing against Good Manners, or against the Rights of the House, or contrary to the Law of the Land, the House would (as they have often done for One or more of these Causes) reject it, and not permit it to come upon the Journal: Well knowing that tho' the Subscribing *Member* only is concerned in the Strength or Weakness of the Reason that He offers, yet the whole House is concern'd if they permit any thing Undecent or Illegal to be entred upon their Journal. And if the House should Resolve to admit a *Protest* upon their Journal, which some *Members* are of Opinion contains *Matter* that is Illegal; those *Members* ought to dissent to such a Resolution, and may enter their *Protest* against it. But for any *Member* to Vote a *Protest* to be entred in the Journal, as in the Case before us, and then desire to enter his Dissent to that very *Matter* which He himself had just before placed upon the Journal, is such an irregular Practice that I believe was never attempted before.

Appen. p. xxii. The Objections against the Paper which the House laid before their Lordships the Bishops, July 29. relating to their *Protesting Members*, are as Frivolous as the Objections against the *Protest*. The *Vindicator* says, that *The carrying up this Appeal to the Upper House was a Thing New, and the Practice contrary to what the Gentlemen concerned in it; Nay, to what the Remarker, pag. 20. has affirm'd to be the constant Right and Custom of the House.* What the Remarker says in the place cited, is against any Private Members of the Lower House *Protesting* in the Upper; and what he has there said, may possibly be applicable to the Case of the Petitioners against the *Protest*: but can't in the least have any Relation to the carrying up *This Paper*, which is acknowledged to be the Act, not of any Private Members, but of the House it self. The *Vindicator* may call it an *Appeal* or what He will, but certainly nothing can be more Regular or more Proper than when any thing

(305)

thing happens which threatens Danger *directly* to some of the Members for *Protesting in Convocation*, and *indirectly* to the whole House for entering that *Protest* upon their Journals; I say, nothing can be more Proper than to apply to the Bishops, and to lay the whole State of the Affair before them; For how otherwise can the House obtain the Advice, Assistance, and Protection of their Lordships? And a Message of this Nature is far from being in effect to make the Lower House *p. xxiii.* *Petition against it self, and to accuse it self for not preserving its own Rights, and to assert that the Protesting Members had a much greater Concern to preserve the Rights and Privileges of Convocation, than the House it self in the former Session.* For what the House in this Paper Asserts, is in effect that the Members who Protested against the Resolution of the House, Protested with an Intent to Preserve the Rights and Privileges of it. And must the House be supposed to *Accuse themselves for not Preserving their own Rights*, because they think that the Members who differ'd from them, did it with an Intent to Preserve them? The House says moreover, That this Protest is (in their Opinion Regular) and what their Members had an Undoubted Right to make: For if they had no Right to make it, the House would not have permitted them to make it; And if it had not been regular, both as to the Matter and Form of it, They would not have entered it in their Journal.

Another Objection against this Paper is, That it put the House *Ibid.* upon Acting *directly contrary to the Resolution before taken to drop the Message relating to Dr. Brown.* I little expected such an Objection from these Gentlemen whose avow'd Principle it is, That the House is so *intirely* Master of its own Resolutions, that they may drop them as they shall see Cause. And if so, why may not They drop the Resolution that was taken to drop the Message relating to Dr. Brown? But the main End of this Paper, here Objected against, was not to revive the *Accusation of Dr. Brown's Behaviour*, as the *Vindicator* affirms: But to desire the Protection of the Upper House, in respect of their *Protesting Members*; and this they could not do without laying a whole State of the Case before their Lordships.

Another Objection against this Paper is, That it was not framed by any express Order of the House, nor refer'd to a Committee. Now if a Committee might have taken this Paper in- *Ibid.* to.

to their Consideration, much more may the House it self do it, from whom alone the Committee derives its Power: The Use and Design of Committees is to Prepare and Digest Matters for the Ease and Dispatch of the House: But if the House thinks fit, they may take any Paper into their immediate Consideration without Committing it, as they have frequently done: And that tho' the Paper is taken into Consideration was never formed by any Express Order of the House.

The other Objections raised against this Paper are either so trifling or so effectually Answered already, that I shall not trouble the Reader with any longer Detail of them. Only I must observe how odd it is, to call this Paper Signed by Dr. *Lambert*, &c. a *Protest*; Whereas it was never so much as read in either House, nor heard of, till now Publish'd by the *Vindicator*.

It is own'd that some few desired to *Protest* against the Resolution taken to send up this Paper concerning the *Protesting Members* to their Lordships, and they were desired to go to the Table and give in their Names to the Actuary, which they did; but when the Names were read over, it was observed that the Names of Two Members, *viz.* Dr. *Ash*, and Mr. *Causeild* were given in, whereas neither of them was in the House when the Resolution passed; The House therefore ordered them to be struck out, and yet the *Vindicator* has Subscribed Mr. *Causeild*'s Name to this his pretended *Protest*, as also Mr. *Griffith*'s, who had not been in the House all that day.

Pag. vii. The *Vindicator* tells us, that the Committee Adjourned from Saturday (June 18.) to Monday (June 20.) This he says, I suppose, to make it seem as if the House had been mistaken as they have related that Affair in the Message which they sent to the Upper House; whereas nothing is more certain, than that the Committee did not so much as meet on Saturday having finished their Business on Friday, June 17. And then the Committee was so far from adjourning at all, that they order'd the Chairman to be ready on Monday to make his Report to the House; which He promised, with this Circumstance, That now he had no more to do but to put the scatter'd Resolves into Form, and write them over fair; And tho' the *Vindicator* relates that a few met upon this pretended Adjournment, yet 'tis well known that there was no such Meeting at all: And all this every Member that attended the Committee declared in the

the House: Nor was there, I believe, One of them but expected the Report on *Monday* accordingly. But had the Committee Adjourned to another day, and the Chairman had failed to meet them upon it, I cannot imagine how the *Vindicator* will support the Inference that He seems to draw from it, that therefore the Committee fell, and every thing that they had done became Null and Void.

That Dr. Brown *said* he was under an Incapacity of giving in p. viii. the Report (on *June 29.*) is true, but that He gave it as a Reason, that he did not then expect to be called upon for it, as the *Vindicator* relates, is quite otherwise; so far was he from giving That as a Reason, that he said, he could not give any Reason of his Incapacity with safety to himself.

The *Vindicator* says, That 21 and 14 was the highest Number p. x. that the House consisted of this Session: What does he think of 42 and 13? Which was the Number that the House consisted of when the Report was made from the Committee on *Aug. 3.*

As far is he from the Truth when he says, that this was one *Introd.* of the longest Sessions that ever the Lower-House of Convocation enjoyed; It was on *May* the 19th that the *Prolocutor* was approved of, and on *Aug.* the 5th the Convocation was Prorogued, so that the whole was not more than Eleven Weeks, of which there was an Adjournment of a whole month at one time; And of a whole Week at another. And therefore this is so far from being the longest Session, that if he will but give himself the Trouble to look over the Books, he will find that we had but One shorter.

He says, that there was an Interval of about a Week, between the Session that the *Protest* of the Thirteen Members was received and the next; whereas there was the Interval of a Month.

He says, That they insisted to have their Dissent against the *Pro-* p. xiv. test entered pursuant to a Resolution of the House at the former Session: Whereas there was no such Resolution. How could the House resolve to enter what they had never seen, and which might contain such Matter in it, as would not be proper to appear upon the Journal?

He says, That some came from the Remotest Parts of the King- *Introd.* dom, left their Cures and their Business, in the very heat of the Harvest, and appear'd in the House to obey the Commands of their Superiors. The Reader would by this imagine, that the Members who attended in Convocation, left their Cures to shift for themselves; an Insinuation of all men in the World the

Ibid.

Ibid.

Ibid.

least proper to come from the *Vindicator*; Whereas I am well satisfied, that not a Member left his Cure to serve the Church in Convocation, but took care to have it well supplied in his Absence. And if they neglected their Temporal Affairs in the Heat of Harvest, as is here suggested, certainly it was very commendable in them to *Postpone* their Temporal Advantage to the Commands of their Superiours. But he leaves it to the Reader to Judge whether the Time of so many Men of Parts and Learning might not have been much more profitably employ'd, either in their particular Charges, or in considering other and weightier Subjects, which would have turn'd to the Honour of Convocations, and the real Interest and Advantage of this Church. How much this Gentleman regards the Honour of Convocations, and the real Interest and Advantage of this Church, the Reader may Judge by the foregoing Papers; and whether the Members of the Lower House did not lie under an Obligation to spend some time in the Vindication of that Honour and that Interest which they saw so basely attacked by the *Letter-Writer*. And yet very far were they from spending so much time about this *Letter* as is here suggested, or *Postponing* and *Neglecting* other Business of greater Consequence for the Censuring of it. For the *Letter* was brought into the House on Friday, May 20. and the Committee sat upon it that Afternoon, and the next Day. And on the Monday following, without so much as debating one Line of the *Letter*, they Adjourn'd the Consideration of it to June 16. for above three Weeks, and all that time I hope he will allow, was taken up with other Business. On June 16. in the Morning, and in the Afternoon of the next day the Committee sat upon the *Letter*, and finish'd the Report, and the House had no trouble with it till June 23. which Session, and the next of June 25. were chiefly taken up by the Chairman's endeavouring to avoid making a Report, as has been already related; Part of the Session of Monday, June 27. was taken up with making the Report and Recommitting the *Letter*; From which time till the 29th of July there was not one Word of the *Letter*, as he himself owns. On that day at Two Sessions the Committee finished the *Letter*, and a Report was made of it on August 3, so that the Reader may see, that this Affair took up but a few Sessions either in the Committee or in the House, altho' the *Vindicator* says, that it took up in great measure the longest Session that ever the Lower House enjoy'd.

And

And as for the other Branch of his Assertion, it is well known, *that no other Business was Post-poned or Neglected for it.* If he will but look over the Minutes; he may find a great deal of other Business done; That particularly of Converting the Papists was not forgotten, as the *Vindicator* insinuates. For Their Lordships sent us down a very gracious Message, desiring Us to think of some Methods proper to be used, to induce Recusants, both Papists and Others to come into the Church, which the House took into their Consideration, and laid some Proposals and Methods proper for that End before their Lordships. Their Lordships were also pleased to lay before the House a certain Scandalous Health, that had given great Offence; And another Message they sent Us concerning the Observation of such Holidays as were particularly enjoyn'd by Act of Parliament. For the *Vindicator's* Use, I will here set down these Two Messages at full length, together with the Answers returned to them by the Lower House.

A Message from the Upper House to the Lower,
concerning a Scandalous Health.

Mr. Prolocutor.

W Hereas we have heard that some Persons have presum'd to Drink an Health (as they call it) to this effect, viz. Plague Pestilence and Famine, Battle Murder and sudden Death to all Archbishops, Bishops, Priests and Deacons, and all Congregations committed to their charge, who shall refuse to Drink to the Glorious Memory of King William; Which words We think to be very Unchristian, Depraving the Liturgy of the Established Church, and highly reflecting upon all the Archbishops, Bishops, and Clergy of this Kingdom, and their Congregations; as if they had not a due Honour for the Glorious Memory of King William.

We have therefore thought fit to communicate thus much to you of the Lower House, and withall to Desire and Charge you, that, as we are very sure, none of you will be ever Guilty of Drinking any such Healths your selves: so you would in your several Cures, to the utmost of your Power, use your Endeavours to Discourage and Prevent the Drinking any Healths in so Scandalous a Manner.

The

The Answer of the Lower House.

May it please your Graces and Lordships,

I Am commanded by the Lower House of Convocation to return their humble Thanks to your Graces and Lordships for the seasonable discouragement you have given, to the great Abuse thrown upon the Clergy and the Liturgy of the Church, by the Scandalous and Unchristian Health (as some call it) mentioned by your Lordships, in your late Message to us.

We have heard, and many of us both before and since your Lordships Intimation, have received full assurance, that the said Health has been publickly and frequently Drank; and we have always heard of it with Horror and Detestation.

We are humbly of Opinion, that Persons may have a due Honour for the late Glorious King William, and a due Sense of the many and great Benefices which this Kingdom, under Gods Providence, has received by him, without expressing it by Drinking to his Memory, in so Prophane and Wicked a Manner. And we are farther of Opinion, that such an Irreligious Practice tends really to Dishonour the Memory of so Glorious a Prince.

We assure your Lordships, that as we have never been Guilty of Drinking any such Health our selves, so in Obedience to your Lordships Commands we will in our several Cures, to the utmost of our Power, use our Endeavours to Discourage and Prevent it in others.

And that our Endeavours may prove the more effectual, we will not only inform them what great Dishonour such a Scandalous Practice brings upon Religion; but also that it is, as we apprehend, directly against the Statute of Uniformity, 1. Eliz. Prohibiting under severe Penalties, all Persons from Declaring or Speaking any thing in Derogation, Depraving, or Despising the Liturgy of the Church.

John Stearne, Proloc.

A Message from the Upper House to the Lower, concerning the Observation of certain Holidays.

W Hereas there are some days required by Act of Parliament to be kept Holy, and of which therefore there ought a due Observation to be had; We therefore earnestly Desire and Charge you, that in Obedience to Her Majesty's Laws, you and every one of you would in your several Cures duly perform Divine Service,
and

and do all other Things which are required by Law and your Superiours, to be done on such Days; and particularly that upon the 22d of October, the 5th of November, the 30th of January, and the 29th of May; you would, besides Divine Service, read an Homily against Rebellion, or Preach up Loyalty and Obedience in a Sermon of your own Compasure to that purpose; the Canons ordering this to be done at Four several times every year, and the Rubrick particularly directing it upon some of these Days; And that you would also take Care to acquaint all whom you Represent, with this our Desire and Charge.

The Answer of the Lower House.

May it please your Graces and Lordships,

THE Lower House of Convocation have Commanded me to acquaint your Graces and Lordships, that they will in Obedience to your Commands, not only in their own Cures duly perform Divine Service, and do all other things which are required by Law and their Superiours to be done on such days, as are required to be kept Holy, and particularly those mentioned by your Lordships: But also take care to acquaint all whom they Represent with your Lordships Desire and Charge.

And they are humbly of Opinion, that such an Intimation as your Lordships have sent them, could never come more seasonably than now; It being commonly reported, that some Doctrines that are contrary to the Principles of our Church, to the particular Directions of the Rubrick of the Book of Common-Prayer, and to the Canons of our Church, most Scandalously Reflecting on the Blessed Memory of King Charles the First, and tending to dispose Mens Minds to Disobedience and Rebellion, were delivered by Mr. Staughton from the Pulpit in Christ-Church, Dublin, on the 31st of January last, being observed as a Day of Fasting, in Memory of the Martyrdom of that most Excellent Prince. And they humbly desire to know of your Lordships, whether it may be advisable for them to make Enquiry into that Sermon.

We beg leave also on this occasion to observe to your Lordships that the Form of Prayer and Thanksgiving for the 5th of November, as it is Published in a late Edition of the Book of Common-Prayer Book of this Kingdom, is very defective; those Collects being only so far as they relate to our Deliverance by the arrival of His late Majesty William of Glorious Memory. And we humbly pray your Graces and Lordships to give Directions that this Defect

*It may be entirely & in effect a Declaration of War against the
Bishops: and that the House of Commons have resolved the Dissolution
of this Parliamt. Edition, when the next Session begins on the
Solemn Day.*

John Sturges, Printer.

To this their Lordships returned in Answer, That they
thought it very advisable for Us to have *Every* into Mr. Stough-
ton's Sermon. But the Convocation being prorogued soon af-
ter, the House had not time to take it into their Con-
sideration.

Before I conclude, it may not be improper to take Notice,
that as soon as the Convocation was prorogued Archdeacon
Mead had Occasion to Complain to the House of Lords, for
both Houses of Parliament continued sitting, tho' the Convo-
cation was prorogued) of a Breach of Privilege committed a-
gainst him, by his Servants being arrested; Whereupon
their Lordships were pleased to refer the Complaint to a Com-
mittee, who having Examined their Journals for Precedents,
Reported to their Lordships several Resolutions, to which their
Lordships unanimously agreed, viz. That the Members of Convo-
cation, sitting the Convocation and Forty days before and Forty days
after the sitting thereof, are intitled to Privilege of Parliament.
That the House of Lords is the proper Judicatory to which the Mem-
bers of Convocation ought to apply when their Privileges of Parlia-
ment are invaded. That the House takes the said Members into
their Protection. That the Case of Archdeacon Mead be refer'd
to the Committee of Privileges to Examine the Truth of the Allegations
thereof; and that his Witnesses be Sworn at the Bar of the House.

This Determination of the House of Lords will not I pre-
sume seem impertinent in a Controversy with One who is
not willing to allow the Convocation any Privileges at all.

And now having given a full Account of the Merits of the
Letter, and of the Proceedings in the Convocation occasion'd
by it, I leave it to the Judgement of every Impartial Reader,
whether the Letter did not deserve those Resolutions which
were pass'd against it: And particularly That it is a False and
Scandalous Libel; and that the Author of it should be proceeded
against with the severest Consuetude that the Law can afford.

FINIS

